DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 791 HE 022 760

AUTHOR	Slinker, John Michael
TITLE	The Role of the College or University President in Institutional Advancement.
PUB DATE	Sep 88
NOTE	224p.; Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Arizona University. Outstanding doctoral dissertation for 1989, John Grenzebach Awards for Outstanding Research in Philanthropy for Education, cosponsored by the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel Trust for Philanthropy and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Alumni; College Administration; *College Presidents; Demography; Fund Raising; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Advancement; Institutional Survival; *Leadership; National Surveys; Publicity; *Public Relations; Questionnaires; Success
IDENTIFIERS	CASE AAFRC Grenzebach Award

ABSTRACT

The role of the college/university president in institutional advancement was examined in a national study. There were interviews with nine presidents and surveys done by 27 chief executive officers. Five areas of investigation are: demographic characteristics of institutional advancement programs; how presidents perceive their role in institutional advancement; what institutional advancement programs presidents identify as successful/unsuccessful; what activities they are willingly involved in; and how they rate personal characteristics in the institutional advancement of professional staff. Findings include: presidents all agree their role in public relations and institutional advancement must be high for the institution to be successful with constituencies; they feel their role in fund raising is very high; up to 96% of them are very willing to meet with governors, state executive branch members, and congressional representatives; and 85% desire a high degree of involvement in the overall advancement program. Fifteen recommendations include: chair the planning committee and involve advancement staff members; abstain from personal involvement in time intensive projects; and hire and retain the best professionals in the field. A copy of the president's questionnaire; a copy of the background questionnaire; and a judgment/stratified random sample by category with location and enrollment are appended. Contains approximately 97 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308791

The Role of the
College or University President
in Institutional Advancement

by

John Michael Slinker

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
in Educational Administration

Northern Arizona University
September 1988

HE 022 760

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Michael Slinker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright by John Michael Slinker 1988

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT IN INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

JOHN MICHAEL SLINKER

The role of the college or university president in institutional advancement is one of the fundamental issues in higher education. Institutional advancement refers to public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations programs and activities.

College and university images are based on the composite impression, knowledge, beliefs, experiences, and enthusiasm constituencies have about the institution. A strong and positive institutional image influences constituencies to support a college or university, to speak favorably of it, and to believe in its mission and goals.

Twenty-eight presidents participated in a national study that included interviews with nine presidents and the completion of a survey instrument by twenty-seven CEO's. Judgement and stratified random samples were taken from a population of forty-six presidents representing public,

private independent, and private religious institutions in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). Members of the judgement sample came from two categories of CASE award-winning institutions from 1985 to 1987.

Among the fifteen recommendations provided to ensure a successful institutional advancement program is the recommendation that the president should establish robust and proactive leadership in advancement as a priority. Proactive and vigorous leadership is required to properly position the institution; to realize the institutional mission; and to facilitate awareness, appreciation, and support by constituencies.

The president should also formulate an advancement strategy that reflects where the institution has been, where it is now, and where it wants to go. Proper advancement strategy can be decisive for a president and institution in realizing the college or university mission. A president's vision, coupled with a willingness and capacity for leadership, are characteristics that will lead to institutional success.

Similar to a Rubik's Cube, a three-dimensional Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership was developed. The model positions the hexagon sides/

components (public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, government relations, institutional personnel, and constituencies) with fifty-four interconnecting subcubes/variables (budget, needs, goals, motivators, skill levels, etc.) to meet the institutional mission. Proactive positioning of the advancement model provides a president with positive opportunities to respond to anticipated challenges through a strategy characterized by reflection, refinement, implementation, and evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Pam, my wife. I cherish your continuous love, encouragement, and support during a challenging period in our lives. You warm me with your smile, comfort me with your touch, and brighten my days with your laughter. I love you very much.

To my family. I am thankful for your love and concern.

To Dr. Robert E. Holloway, my dissertation chairman. Thank you for your guidance, patience and encouragement. I sincerely appreciate your support.

To my dissertation committee members Drs. Ardeth P. Cropper, David J. Markee, Philip R. Rulon, and David M. Whorton. Your willingness to work with me is deeply appreciated.

To Drs. Stephen D. Lapan, Ernesto M. Bernal, and Raymond B. VerVelde. Thank you for my experiences with the Excellence in Teaching journal. My graduate assistantship has made all this possible.

To Drs. Richard D. Packard and Mary Dereshiwsky. Your contributions as ex-officio members of my committee have been very rewarding. Thank you.

To the dedicated professionals in the Center for Excellence in Education. Your answers to questions, encouragement, and support is truly appreciated.

Commencement to the acquisition of scholarly knowledge rests at the door of higher education. Eastern New Mexico University, my alma mater for a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Arts, granted me the degree of opportunity and freedom to reach my potential. I remember Eastern endearingly--for its people and the chance to test my wings.

Scholars at Northern Arizona University remind me that completion of a doctorate, while the highest of academic degrees, is another commencement opportunity--a quest to use my mind in contributing to the future of others. I accept the challenge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page**

1 **Introduction**..................................1
- Overview..1
- Purpose of the Study............................4
- Statement of the Problem........................5
- Definition of Terms.............................6
- Limitations of the Study........................7
- Significance of the Study.......................8

2 **Review of the Literature**.....................10
- Overview..10
- Historical Origin...............................11
- Council for Advancement and Support of Education.15
- Presidential Leadership.........................16
- Advancement Strategy............................20
- Relationship With Trustees......................22
- Planning..24
- Institutional Advancement Mission...............28
- Organizational Structure........................30
- Staffing..33
- Presidential Time...............................36
- Advancement Budget..............................41
- Public Relations................................42
- Fund Raising....................................49
- Alumni Relations................................60
- Government Relations............................62
- Summary...68

3 **Methodology**..................................70
- Overview..70
- Population......................................70
- Instrumentation.................................72
- Description of the Survey Instrument............73
- Data Analysis...................................74
- Summary...75

4 **Analysis of Data**.............................76
- Introduction....................................76
- Demographic Information.........................77
- Presidential Leadership.........................82
- Advancement Strategy............................91
- Relationship With Trustees......................96
- Planning..97
- Staffing..110
- Advancement Budget..............................119
- Public Relations................................126

Fund Raising..........129
Alumni Relations..........139
Government Relations..........146
The Future of Institutional Advancement..........153
Summary..........154
5 Summary, Advancement Model, Recommendations..........155
Summary..........155
Presidential Leadership..........157
Advancement Strategy..........160
Planning..........162
Staffing..........165
Advancement Budget..........166
Public Relations..........167
Fund Raising..........169
Alumni Relations..........170
Government Relations..........173
Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership..........174
Recommendations..........177
Suggestions for Further Study..........186
References..........188
Appendix A..........196
Appendix B..........203
Appendix C..........206
Biography..........209

LIST OF TABLES

Table **Page**

1 Responding Institutions by Stratified Sample and Category....78

2 Institutions Declining to Participate Due to Busy Schedules by Stratified Sample and Category...79

3 Presidential Experience or Training in Institutional Advancement....82

4 How Presidents Rate Their Involvement in Specific Programs....88

5 How Much Involvement Presidents Desire in Institutional Advancement Programs....89

6 Programs Presidents Consider the Strongest and Weakest at Their Institution....90

7 Importance of the Role of the President in Advancement Programs for the Institution to be Successful with Constituencies....94

8 Degree of Success Presidents Expect in Institutional Advancement Areas....95

9 Degree to which Goals and Objectives are Based on the Institutional Mission and Clearly Defined..100

10 Frequency in which the President Establishes Long-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff....101

11 Frequency in which the President Reviews Long-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff....102

12 Frequency in which the President Establishes Short-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff....103

13 Frequency in which the President Reviews Short-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff....104

14 Frequency in which the President Tracks Advancement Progress with the Institutional Advancement Staff....105

15 Frequency in which the President Involves Other Offices in Advancement Activities with the Institutional Advancement Staff....106

16 Frequency in which the President Conducts Research with the Institutional Advancement Staff that Relates to Constituencies....107

17 Frequency in which the President Communicates Plans to Faculty and Staff Through the Institutional Advancement Staff....108

18 Frequency in which the President Offers Advancement Services to Faculty and Staff with the Institutional Advancement Staff....109

19 Frequency in which the President Encourages Faculty and Staff to Participate in Advancement Activities with the Institutional Advancement Staff....110

20 The Importance of Characteristics Valued by Presidents in their Professional Staff....112

21 Presidential Source Reliance for Information in Institutional Advancement Areas....114

22 1987-1988 College or University Professional Staff by Enrollment and Institutional Advancement Area....116

23 1987-1988 College or University Support Staff by Enrollment and Institutional Advancement Area....118

24 Frequency in which the President Establishes Budgets to Coordinate with Plans for the Institutional Advancement Staff....119

25 1987-88 Total College or University Budget by Enrollment....120

26 1987-88 College or University Public Relations Budget by Enrollment....121

27 1987-88 College or University Fund Raising Budget by Enrollment....122

28 1987-88 College or University Alumni Relations Budget--Excluding the Alumni Relations Periodical--by Enrollment....123

29 1987-88 College or University Alumni Periodical Budget by Enrollment....124

30 1987-88 College or University Government Relations Budget by Enrollment....125

31 President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Public Relations Activities..128

32 President's Willingness to Accept Responsibility to Call on and Close Prospects Contributing Through Fund Raising Activities....132

33 President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Fund Raising Activities......133

34 1986-1987 College or University Annual Funds Raised by Enrollment....134

35 1986-1987 College or University Capital Campaign Funds Raised by Enrollment....135

36 1986-1987 College or University Foundation Grants Funds Raised by Enrollment....136

37 1986-1987 College or University Individual Colleges and Schools Funds Raised by Enrollment...137

38 1986-1987 College or University Planned Giving Funds Raised by Enrollment....138

39 President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Alumni Relations Activities....142

40 1986-1987 College or University Alumni Giving Funds Raised by Enrollment....144

41 1987-88 College or University Alumni on the Periodical Mailing List by Enrollment.............145

42 1987-88 College or University Periodical Publishing Times a Year by Enrollment.............146

43 President's Willingness to Meet with Specific Government Relations Individuals..................152

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The role of the college or university president in institutional advancement is one of the fundamental issues in higher education. Institutional advancement refers to public relations, fund raising, alumni relations and government relations programs and activities practiced by professionals. Each component of institutional advancement serves a specific and broad function "...to develop understanding and support from all its constituencies in order to achieve its goals in securing such resources as students, faculty, and dollars" (Rowland, 1986).

The need exists to address systematically the question of effective presidential leadership in higher education advancement activities. Leadership in advancement facilitates constituency support and appreciation. Advancement leadership enhances the maintenance and development of institutional programs including curriculum development, enrollment management, academic and student support services, research, and administrative support and activities.

Presidents require increased sophistication in the role and functions of institutional advancement to effectively interact with target constituencies. In any college or university it is important for the president to know the extent of presidential responsibilities, as well as limitations.

The inception of contemporary institutional advancement can be traced to the colonial period when contributions and actions by wealthy individuals, alumni, and government agencies permitted the founding and continual growth of the first higher education institution in the United States, Harvard University (Morison, 1935). Independent and private religious institutions have historically been more deeply involved in advancement activities because their futures rested on significant financial support from donors and alumni. Public colleges and universities have generally based their continued existence on state appropriations and paid little attention to securing support from donors, corporations, foundations, and alumni.

In the past decade state legislatures and the federal government have shifted more of the responsibility for financial support to public colleges and universities. Presidents and other administrators must now take additional responsibility to secure funds beyond legislative appropriations. Institutions are refining their relations with government leaders in order to receive their fair share of state and federal resources. Considerable attention is being devoted to potential donors, both individual and corporate. Alumni are being asked to play a more prominent role in the financial support of their alma mater. Graduating seniors at some institutions are informed of the need for their continued support prior to leaving the institution. Faculty and staff are encouraged to give financially for scholarships, research and other worthy needs. With state and federal cutbacks, in addition to the recent emergence of public institutions into the business of private solicitation, fund raising competition is keen between public and private institutions.

Today institutional advancement is one of the cornerstones upon which the future of an institution rests. To varying degrees, institutions are dependent on their relations with government leaders, alumni, and donors for financial support. Service to the state and community is important in maintaining positive relations with constituencies. In all instances, public and private institutions rely on constituency support for their continued existence. Constituencies support colleges and universities because they believe in what the institutions represent, the institution's contributions to society, and because the institutions touch their lives in meaningful ways. Complacency and procrastination in advancement activities must be avoided.

Success in institutional advancement is the ultimate responsibility of the president. However, the president does not stand alone, but has considerable support from professionals and volunteers in achieving institutional advancement goals and objectives. Presidents, advancement professionals, and other leaders mutually educate constituencies to higher education's overall role, the institution's mission, and then to specific institutional needs.

Purpose of the Study

The leading challenges for institutions in the next decade, according to Quehl (1987), are to enhance the public's confidence in higher education, to clarify educational missions, and to be concerned about the quality of educational offerings. Presidents must plan responses for these challenges and effectively implement these plans through well thought out institutional advancement activities.

This study provides a descriptive and anecdotal documentation of the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement with a goal to extend and create knowledge that will have useful application for presidents and institutional advancement practitioners in higher education. An additional goal is to provide an empirical base for the future study of significant definitive characteristics of successful institutional advancement programs.

Statement of the Problem

The problem requiring study is how college and university presidents perceive the role of the president in institutional advancement. Specifically the study is an investigation of the following:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of institutional advancement programs for institutions in the study?

2. How do presidents perceive the role of the president in institutional advancement?

3. What institutional advancement programs do presidents identify as successful or in need of improvement?

4. In what activities is the president willing to become directly involved?

5. How does the president rate various personal characteristics in the institutional advancement professional staff?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions will be used:

Alumni Relations--Activities and programs used to enhance and construct relationships with former and current students to develop resources tied directly to public relations, fund raising, and government relations.

College/University--A four-year institution of higher education in the United States that is a member of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)--An international association for institutional advancement professionals and an advocate of higher education.

Fund Raising--Programs encompassing annual giving, major gifts, capital campaigns, and planned giving. Sources of funding are alumni, corporations, foundations, religious organizations, faculty and staff, parents, private donors, friends of the institution, and current students.

Government Relations--Events and procedures concerned with working cooperatively with local, state and federal governments to capitalize on resource development, institutional positioning, and better relations with administrative and regulatory officials, particularly elected officials.

Institutional Advancement--Public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations programs and activities practiced by professionals to favorably position an institution with target constituencies.

Private Independent Institution--A college or university that is independent of state control and religious affiliation.

Private Religious Institution--A college or university that has a religious affiliation, but is independent of state control.

Public Institution--A college or university that is state controlled and financed.

Public Relations--Internal and external programs and activities used to educate target audiences in an effort to build institutional support. Programs and activities include print and broadcast news, special events, photography, graphic arts and publications, marketing, speech writing and presentations, internal and external relations, advertising, media relations, and public information.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are:

1. Information gathered was limited to the number of presidents at four-year institutions who chose to respond.

2. Information gathered was limited to those questions asked on the questionnaires and the respondents' understanding of the questions.

3. Information gathered was limited to personal communication with selected presidents who indicated a willingness to be interviewed.

4. Information gathered was limited to the institutional advancement activities and programs operated by the college or university or known to the respondent.

Significance of the Study

The role of the college or university president in institutional advancement is a complicated one that embraces a number of secondary responsibilities revolving around a central institutional mission. Institutional advancement is a major responsibility of the president who shapes and positions both the institution's mission and communicates that mission to constituencies.

The president must positively address important issues confronting higher education in general and the institution specifically. In responding to challenging issues, a different kind of leadership style and substance is required from the chief advancement officer. Presidents need to be particularly skilled and enlightened to represent the institution to the public, government leaders, alumni, media, donors, foundations, and a variety of other constituencies.

Examples of meaningful what and why issues addressed by the president are the following: 1) What is the mission of the institution and how does the institution realistically contribute to state and constituency needs? 2) Why is the institution concentrating its educational efforts in one area over another? 3) What efforts should the institution be making toward solving problems in society?

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

In conducting a review of the literature relevant to this study, it is apparent that institutional advancement has become essential to higher education management. An imperative for successful management in higher education is the role a college or university president takes in institutional advancement.

Public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations form the four corners of the institutional advancement table, although other disciplines such as enrollment management and athletics often become advancement leaves. The four fundamental disciplines, however, are intrinsic to meeting the institutional mission, as well as reaching goals and objectives through the cultivation of constituency support.

This chapter will be divided into the following areas: Historical Origin, Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Presidential Leadership, Advancement Strategy, Relationship With Trustees, Planning, Institutional

Advancement Mission, Organizational Structure, Staffing, Presidential Time, Advancement Budget, Public Relations, Fund Raising, Alumni Relations, and Government Relations.

Historical Origin

The origin of institutional advancement in the United States dates from the founding of Harvard (College) University in 1636, the first higher education institution in the American colonies. From its inception to its development today, Harvard has capitalized on activities in public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations.

The first tie to government relations came in 1636 when the General Court of the Massachusetts colony made the "...earliest recorded appropriation for public education in New England..." by giving 400 pounds towards what was to become Harvard (Morison, 1935, pp. 164-165). The General Court took an active interest in higher education and worked to obtain support from outlying communities. In 1819 the University of Virginia became the first higher education institution in the United States to be identified as a public institution (Dabney, 1981).

A policy of providing federal assistance to higher education without federal control was favored in the early years. Land, the chief form of government wealth, was donated by the government to colleges as land grants in the western states (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976).

Morison (1935, p. 210) points out that "...John Harvard did not initiate the foundation that bears his name, or obtain the charter that gave it corporate existence, or provide the funds to set it in motion", but he was a significant benefactor to the institution. John Harvard was well-to-do and gave one half of his estate and his considerable library to the college upon his death in 1638. Most legacies of that period were left to the churches and the General Court named the school in honor of John Harvard because of his gift.

Other early contributions to the higher education institution came from government and civic leaders such as Governor Bellingham, Governor Winthrop, and Anne (Radcliffe) Mowlson. In 1678 Joseph Browne became the first graduate on record to make a gift to his college when he willed 100 pounds for the college and 50 pounds for the college library (Morison, 1935, p. 267).

The cultivation of revenue for Harvard began in 1641 when three Massachusetts colonists made a trip to England to raise funds for the financially distressed college (Morison, 1935). In an effort to secure large donations, the representatives carried a 26-page public relations pamphlet entitled New Englands First Fruits. The written appeal by the college also included a letter of support from the governor.

Presidential involvement in advancement activities may be traced to Henry Dunster, the first Harvard president (Morison, 1935). Dunster was totally involved in advancing the institutional mission and wrote a portion of New Englands First Fruits. He also solicited financial support from the colonial government and individuals.

The first evidence of alumni relations began in 1643 when former Harvard students began returning to commencement ceremonies to visit with professors and students (Ransdell, 1986). Yale University began the practice of having each class appoint an alumni secretary in 1792 (Shaw, 1930). The Society of Alumni, organized at Williams College in 1821, was the first official alumni organization to be chartered. Its purpose was to advance literature, develop fellowship among alumni, and to enhance the welfare and reputation of the institution (Rudolph, 1956).

More than 100 alumni associations were established by the late 1800s. The concept caught on because officials believed "...organized alumni could perpetuate the qualities and strengthen the weaknesses of an institution and, in so doing, add value to a degree earned at that institution" (Ransdell, 1986, p. 374). The appointment of the first professional alumni secretary in 1897 by the University of Michigan culminated in a conventional alumni movement (Shaw, 1942).

Colleges also had to deal with a breakdown in relationships with faculty, students, and the public. With verbal communication as the chief form of communication, constituencies had limited access to the quality and quantity of information concerning colleges. Eventually catalogs, reports and newspapers were commonly used to communicate an institution's viewpoint (Richards and Sherratt, 1981).

According to Davidson (1956, p. 16), "Most of the public relations problems...centered around the task of getting a college started, the ability of the curriculum to meet the needs of society, and the relationship of students and faculty to the local community."

Professionals in public relations and higher education met in 1958 at the Greenbrier Hotel in West Virginia to discuss advancement issues that culminated in the Greenbrier Report. Until that time most institutions had fragmented programs in institutional advancement. The Greenbrier effort defined and improved advancement programs, but more importantly provided a mandate and guidelines to advance higher education's support and understanding of the programs (Richards and Sherratt, 1981).

Public relations, fund raising, alumni relations and government relations have played a significant role in the establishment and growth of colleges and universities in the United States since colonial times. Presidential commitment to institutional advancement has occurred since the founding of Harvard and will continue to play an important role for colleges and universities.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education

Today the primary advocate of institutional advancement in higher education is the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The origin of CASE may be traced through two predecessor organizations founded in the 1920s. The American Alumni Council and American College Public Relations Association merged in 1974 to become CASE (Beeman, 1977).

In little more than a decade CASE has grown to be the educational association with the largest institutional membership in the United States. More than 2,800 accredited colleges, universities and independent schools are members. Approximately 13,000 professionals represent their institutions in the fields of public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1987).

CASE states that their mission is to increase professionalism in advancement without losing sight of why the profession exists, to strengthen the link between advancement and the pursuit of educational quality, and to shape public judgments and support of education (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1987).

Presidential Leadership

The president has been called the chief advancement officer since the 1940's when Harral (1942, p. 205) stated:

> By virtue of his position the president is the executive head of the public relations program. [The term public relations was commonly used during this period to denote present-day institutional advancement activities.] As such he furnishes creative leadership, leads in the formation of policies and builds procedures. It is the president's job to point out what should be done in public relations objectives, suggest means for accomplishing those goals, stimulate interest in the program, and then delegate the details to responsible staff members.

Persons (1946, p. 3) noted that institutional advancement functions in "...any organization are the rightful responsibilities of its chief administrative officer. However he may arrange and delegate, as to operations, the responsibility remains his because he, and he alone, represents the institution as a whole."

Institutional advancement is one element in a spectrum of responsibilities contemporary presidents address to meet challenges of society, inspire support for higher education, and fulfill the institutional mission. While a president does not need a background in advancement, Cheshire (1980, p. 14) believes it is important for the president to:

> ...be at the center of the advancement effort: suggesting, critiquing, judging, challenging, and performing. As he is part of it, he will be a force in it, and that is essential to the moving spirit of what must be a total institutional commitment.

The president contributes to the total institutional image due to higher visibility and policy influence (Topor, 1986). Internal and external constituencies look to the president for leadership, seeking attention, support, and direction. According to Harral (1942), "the basic task of the president is to give the initial momentum to changes that seem necessary and then stand in the background and see that the machinery functions smoothly" (p. 214).

More than a management concept, institutional advancement is a leadership process (Clugston, 1981). Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p. 3) define this process as "...working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals. Leadership occurs any time one attempts to influence the behavior of an individual or group, regardless of the reason."

James L. Fisher, the leading theoretician of institutional advancement in the 1980's, believes that properly understanding the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement is imperative to address the questions of effective leadership in American higher education (Fisher, 1987).

Increased sophistication by the president in institutional advancement is necessary to solve some of the problems in higher education. Involvement becomes pivotal when a president "...comes to see himself as one who is actively engaged in helping to shape the fortunes of the institution (Cheshire, 1980, p. 11). Fisher (1980a, p. viii) writes that:

> ...lack of knowledge on the part of the presidents occurs most frequently in the areas of institutional advancement. Because presidents do not know much about effective fund raising, alumni relations, government liaison, or public relations, they tend to be anxious, suspicious, or disdainful of these activities...Unless presidents can learn how to relate to external audiences and how to oversee the staffing and organization of an effective advancement effort, their institutions will suffer. The result will be fewer flexible dollars and diminished public understanding at a time when both are needed more than ever.

It is impossible for an institution to change and progress without strong presidential leadership. "The future...belongs to those with the vision and the courage to come to terms with it straightforwardly" (Cheshire, 1980, p. 18). "Change will not come without presidential leadership" (Hesburgh, 1979, p. 15). Among the various constituencies of a president, Hesburgh (1979, p.15) notes:

> ...the alumni, who are the best evidence of our productive and continuing efforts; the public, who largely gave birth to our institutions and generously support them when we win their appreciation of our work. Both are important. I could also speak of the government, local, state, and federal, that today has such impact, maybe too much, on our institutions.

A president should have a strong sense of responsibility to the institution, the public, and state government, devoting a major effort to improving and developing internal and external relations (Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1969).

> How well the people decide about the future of public higher education depends upon how well they understand the problems, the alternatives proposed, and the course of the future that will be fashioned by their decisions. Public higher education has a high-priority obligation constantly to provide the information, constantly to assure the opportunity for understanding which the people need for intelligent participation in decision-making about the future of their higher education system (Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1969, p. 3).

A president's willingness and capacity for leadership will ultimately determine the success of institutional advancement. Smith (1986) notes that the president must clearly articulate the institutional mission through inspiration and initiative.

Clugston (1981) points out that leadership in colleges and universities is both a presence and a synthesis of vision and ideas. The president has traditionally shared the vision and ideas through a number of print and verbal mediums. But for an institution to be effective in its mission, the vision and ideas must also emanate from the advancement organization and spread to different constituencies. To accomplish that task, a president must bring together an advancement team that is skilled, professional, creative, and united for a common purpose.

Since leadership is not the sole responsibility of the president, "...it is possible for the president to think conceptually and creatively, rather than defensively" (Clugston, 1981, p. 9). This permits the president to operate in two spheres: 1) the institutional advancement organizational sphere and 2) a sphere involving constituents. Operating in both spheres permits greater presidential objectivity when looking at issues and ideas.

Advancement Strategy

Proactive, reactive, and laissez-faire leadership are prevalent management styles used by presidents in institutional advancement. Rosenberg (1983) defines proactive leadership as a style in which "...decision makers anticipate problems and take affirmative steps to minimize those problems, rather than waiting until a problem occurs before taking action" (p. 394) According to Rosenberg (1983), reactive leadership takes place when leaders "...respond to problems rather than anticipating problems before they occur" (p. 417), while laissez-faire leadership is that of minimum involvement.

Proactive leaders are characterized as individuals who take initiative, seek out others, evoke expectations, are decisive, forceful, charismatic, and consistent (Larson, Bussom, Vicars, & Jauch, 1986; Wieck, 1983; Zaleznik, 1977). Proactive leaders also devote time to logical, long-term planning, establishing specific objectives.

Zaleznik (1977) describes reactive leaders as impassive individuals whose goals seem to "arise out of necessities rather than desires" (p. 71). Kolb (1983) and Wieck (1983) assert that some of a leader's actions must be reactive in response to institutional and constituency forces.

The president's strategy for institutional advancement (Jacobson, 1986) includes initial responsibility for structuring, creating, maintaining, enhancing, and improving the relationship between a college or university with constituencies. The relationships should be productive for an institution to carry out its mission.

Advancement programs involve eight progressive stages to affect constituency attitudes and behavior. The stages, according to Jacobson (1986, p. 20) are : 1) contact, 2) attention, 3) awareness, 4) comprehension, 5) interest, 6) involvement, 7) conviction, and 8) action. To successfully move through the eight stages, presidents should develop in themselves and their staff an optimistic attitude and pluralistic approach to management, an ability to see what is essential, a respect for the potential of the long-term, sound judgement in a variety of areas, creativity and imagination, and a sensitivity to the values of higher education in general and of their own institution.

Relationship With Trustees

> College or university trustees are opinion leaders who are appointed partly because they represent certain professions, socio-economic levels, and other groups. As the primary links between the president of the institution and the general public, the trustees must understand the communications process, and they must assume responsibility for interpreting the institution on a continuing basis (Rydell, 1977, p. 58).

President's serve the interests of their institution as those interests are broadly or narrowly defined by trustees. Presidential duties vary due to the type and size of the institution. The president of a large private institution, for example, may place more emphasis on fund raising than a president at a mid-sized public college or university.

Trustee involvement in institutional activities also differs from one institution to another due to the structure of the board. Typical organizational structures for trustees include boards specifically selected to serve private institutions, public boards serving one institution, and public boards overseeing a college or university system. Presidents should develop a close working relationship with trustees and keep board members informed about current issues, activities, and institutional concerns (Rydell, 1977). In communicating with the board the president should "...take pains to weave in his own philosophy of education, since the more his trustees know about the educational program and the rationale thereof, the more potent they become as counselors and defenders of the institution" (Dodds, Robb, & Taylor 1962, p. 250).

Presidents have a responsibility to inform trustees that when an individual board member speaks in public, the trustee's comments affect the institution. "An individual who speaks unofficially should make that clear, and an official spokesman for the governing board should be guided by established policy" (Rydell, 1977, p. 58).

Presidents should strive to involve trustees in fund solicitation, in addition to seeking contributions from board members (Whittier, 1980). Trustees should be used to ask for large gifts when the institution would benefit from their prominence and influence (Francis, 1980). Kohr (1977,

p. 239) points out that trustees "...like any other prospects, should be solicited; just because they are trustees, it should not be assumed that they will give automatically."

Because trustees represent the public in state colleges and universities, their influence with government officials can greatly assist the external relations activities of the institution (Rydell, 1977). Like any other presidential constituency, trustees play a significant role in the institutional advancement process. Trustee participation in advancement activities should be encouraged, cultivated, and appreciated by presidents.

Planning

Quehl (1987) believes that the president is the senior or chief advancement officer of the institution in shaping and positioning both the institution's mission and communicating that mission to constituencies. "The president's educational leadership is possible only if he or she demonstrates effective political leadership in obtaining human and material resources. To cultivate support, a college and its president must first clearly understand the institution's mission, purposes, and goals" (Sweet, 1980, p. 37).

An educational mission states the reason the institution or one of its entities exists and provides direction and meaning to activities and programs (Jacobson, 1978). The college or university mission should be the basis for all institutional advancement programs.

"Training in academe simply bears no relationship at all to the college or university presidency today (Quehl, 1987). That's one of the bitter ironies. A person who has to go to out and position the institution has a great deal to learn since many things are foreign to him or her." Quehl (1987) notes that:

> Nothing equals the complete understanding of what the education mission of the institution is. It starts from that point. Show me a president who does not know and cannot be articulate about the educational purpose of the institution and I'll show you a failed presidency ultimately. Everything that I believe in fact about institutional advancement deals with what I call the what and why questions. Those are the questions that a president first or foremost must deal with. In the past too much of institutional advancement has dealt with the how-to questions. It's been a field that deals more with the means rather than the ends of education.

"A president cannot speak without commitment or without knowledge. It is not only the president's obligation to convey commitment to the institution but to convey to each constituency his or her commitment to them" (Rabbino, 1980, p. 29).

A college or university president must persuade internal and external constituencies to use their talents to the best of their ability and allow their creative efforts to become the realization of the educational mission (Hesburgh, 1979). The president's vision must be "educationally sound and integral, given the available resources" (p. 12). Beyond a presidential style and vision, there must be substance.

Presidents must address the following questions: 1) Where is the institution and advancement program now? 2) How did the institution and advancement program get to where it is today? 3) Where is the institution and advancement program going? 4) Where should the institution and advancement program be heading? 5) How will the institution and advancement program get to where it is heading? All of the questions revolve around the needs of society and the effect of the implications should be clearly explained to constituencies.

Benefits of a plan (Manning, 1980) include the following: 1) Building confidence in an organization and its leaders by demonstrating the organization knows what it wants and needs to do. 2) Building a commitment to the institution through informed internal and external constituencies. 3) Reporting goals that have been reached provides accountability to internal and external constituencies. 4) Aiding fund raising by providing a direction to the types of gifts needed and the manner the gifts will be used to enhance the mission of the institution.

Success in institutional advancement requires the articulation of goals and objectives through long-range and short-range plans (Willmer, 1981). Goals and objectives should be comprehensive, all-inclusive, and based on the institutional mission. Plans should be written for the entire advancement program and each discipline--public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations. "If unattended to, an erroneous image can destroy a college as easily as it can doom a commercial enterprise" (Buchanan, 1981, p. 49).

Nelson (1986, p. 48) asserts that objectives be "...quantitative, and set within a time frame," with Ciervo (1986) stressing the importance of assessing areas of success, failure, and methods of improvement.

Institutional advancement professionals are flooded with requests to publicize or accept advancement projects from every constituency (Ciervo, 1986). Presidents should ensure that advancement staffs not be swayed from more important activities and continue to direct their work at goals that have been targeted.

Goals and objectives should be tailored to a college's or university's mission and resources (Ciervo, 1986). Common goals all institutional advancement practitioners have include "conveying a positive public image of the institution to engender....public interest and participation in activities of the institution....[and] generating financial support from government, business, industrial, and private sources..." (Ciervo, 1986, p. 25).

Rabbino provided a universal view of the importance of planning when she stated (1980, p. 32) the following:

> The president must foster a setting where there can be a flow of creative thinking, where things are not done just because they have always been done, where the chain of command is not a chain that binds but a linkage that heightens the opportunities for each individual to make and keep making important and effective contributions to the whole network of advancement projects and programs.

Institutional Advancement Mission

There are four ground rules Muller (1986) believes govern successful college and university advancement programs. The first is that while advancement professionals have specific talents, goals, and objectives, it is more effective to treat all practitioners in advancement as a single, interdependent staff under the direction of an administrator who reports directly to the president.

Second, institutional advancement staff must function as an integral part of the entire college or university community. An institutional advancement program needs total understanding and commitment from the institution, not just the president. Institutional support must be based on a plan that involves consultations between internal constituencies and advancement professionals who must develop the resources to implement the plan. Since advancement staff are not the only campus individuals who will be contacted by external constituencies, it is beneficial to involve students, administrators, faculty, and other professional staff.

A third vital task of institutional advancement is to develop effective internal communication to maintain campus morale, an immense factor affecting a college or university's external reputation.

The fourth ground rule advocated by Muller is that there is a never-ending necessity for institutional advancement. To maintain needed institutional resources, presidents must guard against the loss of advancement momentum and program or activity interruptions.

Some colleges and universities will not prosper because they have not placed a bold and honest emphasis on their educational programs, as well as their management designs. Fisher (1980b, pp. 84-85) notes that:

> They will not have realistically involved faculty, students, and trustees in accomplishing the goals of the institution; they will have depended on sporadic efforts in government relations, fund raising, alumni

relations, and public affairs instead of on a continuous development program that emphasizes educational ideas rather than institutional needs; and they will be led by presidents who are neither bold nor enlightened and who spend more time lamenting than progressing.

Organizational Structure

A good advancement program can save an institution in trouble (Fisher, 1980b). Presidents must provide direction for the institution and advancement program, as well as surrounding themselves with "persons better than they....To be so insecure as to be comfortable only in the company of lessors guarantees failure" (p. 90). Presidential associates must be capable professionals with characteristics of wisdom and loyalty that the president seeks and respects.

Presidents and other practitioners in institutional advancement must understand the educational system and the complex functions of a higher education institution (Radock, 1977). "Each institution must determine the form of organization that will most efficiently and effectively enable it to achieve it mission" (p. 445).

Basically there are two models of organization: 1) centralized and 2) noncentralized. According to Shea (1986) a centralized organization is the most common and operates with all advancement functions under one administrator who reports directly to the president. In the noncentralized model several advancement administrators report directly to the president or may report to different senior administrators.

The area of institutional advancement, Fisher (1987) contends, should report to the president at a vice presidential level. The leadership team, generally composed of vice presidents for various areas, should share responsibility for effective management. Too often one college or university vice president will have more authority in institutional governance than other vice presidential colleagues and take advantage of that circumstance by abusing that power. Generally it is the advancement vice president who is the low delegate in the leadership team, thus compromising decision making in the leadership council and pushing aside the imperative for dynamic institutional advancement.

Fisher (1985a, p. 12) suggested:

> We must remember that today, in most cases, we are an anomaly in academe. We are accepted at the academic conference table largely out of a pressing need for us rather than out of appreciation for what we are and what we do as professionals. The key will be for us to remain at that table after 1995.

It is not necessary for the advancement vice president to chair the academic or business table, but that individual ought to have seats at those tables (Fisher, 1987). The advancement vice president should chair the advancement table, while others recognize the trained professional who is in that chair.

No matter which organizational model is used, the bottom line is effectiveness for the advancement functions and the institution. In establishing a successful advancement effort a partnership should be forged between the president and the advancement staff, particularly the vice president for advancement (Ritter, 1984). While different in personality, the president and members of the advancement team should respect each other's style and work toward conciliation rather than confrontation. Candor is essential, but should be tempered with respect for the individual.

Presidents must delegate as much of the decision making as administrators can handle (Ritter, 1984). Avoid the shotgun management approach where everyone is responsible for everything. This concept too often translates into no one is responsible for anything. Effective management requires controls and a clear definition of the chain of command is not only essential, but practical. Responsibilities and guidelines should be established, particularly with regard to involving the chief executive in advancement functions.

Staffing

"Because of the institutional advancement officers, the academic program will be more effective, the research activities better understood, and the public service program more relevant to the community. Their efforts maximize all functions of colleges and universities" (Rowland (1977, p. 531). Cheshire (1980, p. 9) points out that "the most important thing a chief executive can do in the interest of advancing the institution is to be a good chief executive. He or she must enlist and retain the assistance of those whose interest can do the most good."

This requires a pledge of sufficient staffing for professional and support personnel (Willmer, 1981). Presidents must employ a vice president or other executive administrator in advancement who is capable of developing and prioritizing goals and objectives consistent with the college or university mission. The advancement executive must also be able to attract, hire, train, motivate, and retain skilled professionals; apportion budgets; and evaluate overall results.

Presidents should insist on loyalty from their institutional advancement staffs and expect professionals to organize their work, manage their time, delegate properly, and meet established deadlines (Ciervo, 1986).

The president must mirror the institutional mission, goals, and objectives that he or she helped define (Rowland, 1977). Both the president and advancement staff are major bonds between constituencies and the institution. Because of those special bonds, it is essential that the president and advancement personnel have a close and effective working relationship. Practitioners in advancement must have familiarity with teaching, public service, and research of the institution since they are responsible for interpreting the institution to constituencies and obtaining support.

"Credibility is to an institution what morality is to the individual. Without it, acceptance from the public is difficult, if not impossible, to attain" (Ciervo, 1986, p. 122). Institutional credibility can be secured and maintained by presidential insistence of high ethical standards, candor, and honesty in dealing with constituencies. Too many administrators sell constituencies short and note that constituencies are not capable of accurately judging the institution due to a lack of information. Other administrators are obsessed with presenting only positive information, whether or not the information is newsworthy or of constituency interest. "Such an obsession with positivism...destroys credibility" (Ciervo, 1986, pp. 122-123).

Institutional advancement at most institutions is a line division reporting directly to the president. It is important that the right person be selected to head the advancement area because this individual can mean "...the difference between an average or distinguished presidency and, for many institutions, the difference between success or failure" (Fisher, 1985b, p. 52).

Presidents who do not know what the basic function of institutional advancement should be tend to think almost any one can do the job (Fisher, 1987). Advancement is the area in which presidents often hire an unqualified friend to be a vice president over the advancement functions. Private colleges and universities have paid more attention to their appointments because fund raising, public relations and alumni affairs are the basis of support. However, some presidents at prestigious private institutions make poor appointments and still raise money in spite of themselves.

Presidents should hire someone in whom the president has full confidence, regardless of paper qualifications. The selected advancement professional needs to be flexible and capable of working with political leaders and local aristocracy. Compatibility between the president and advancement professionals is critical (Fisher, 1987). If you have compatibility and are minus experience, the opportunity exists to educate individuals in advancement functions. Incompatibility is an obstacle that is seldom overcome.

Trust between the president and institutional advancement staff can evolve through a shared vision developed by understanding, recognizing and valuing leadership, not just in the president, but in members of the advancement team (Clugston, 1981).

Hesburgh (1979) encourages presidents to trust their staffs. Disagreements will occur and a president should keep an open mind and permit change. Presidents do not have a monopoly on intelligence or talent and should not believe they are indispensable. Associates should be permitted to make announcements and get whatever credit is due, since over time, presidents will receive their fair share.

A college or university president must have courage to stand alone, even during times of crisis. Hesburgh (1979, p. 5) notes the following:

> Every decision is not, of course, a great moral crisis. But I have found few decisions that did not have a moral dimension that could only be ignored with considerable risk, not just for oneself, but particularly for justice, whose final spokesmen all presidents are. When the president abdicates this fundamental responsibility, people are hurt. When he exercises it, he often finds himself alone.

Presidential Time

Time management is important whether a chief executive officer heads a corporate business or institution of higher education Lachman (1985). Worthy (1988) points out that it is important for presidents to spend time analyzing how they will use their time. An efficient use of that time is preparing to be opportunistic and it is important for CEO's to allocate time for specific tasks and not use time in a ad hoc manner.

Business CEO's spend 47 percent of their time on planning and decision making activities, while 31 percent is spent contacting constituencies, making prospect calls, and working in specialty areas (Staff, 1980).

College and university presidents are engrossed in innumerable activities and work approximately 50 to 60 hours a week (Cohen and March, 1974; Williamson, 1987). "There is not enough time. There are too many people to see. There are too many things to do" (Cohen and March, 1974, p. 125).

Generally, presidential roles require spending about 47 percent of the average workday (8 a.m. to 6 p.m.) on campus, with 14 percent of the time spent away from campus in the local community. Twenty-two percent of a president's time is spent out of town, while only 16 percent is spent at home (Cohen and March, 1974).

Presidential roles combine being an administrator working with subordinates, a political leader dealing with constituents, and an entrepreneur involved with customers, suppliers, and bankers. Presidents attend to administrative functions in the morning and afternoon, work on external activities at noon, and start engaging in political activities in late afternoon and early evening (Cohen and March, 1974).

Recent studies by Williamson (1987) indicate that presidents spend 21 percent of their time in ceremonial, public relations, and fund raising activities, while 26 percent of their time is devoted to organizational planning. Organizational directing receives 27 percent of a president's time, with other activities consuming 26 percent of the chief executive's time.

A president's involvement in institutional advancement is constant, periodic, and deals with the schedules and planning process of the institution (Quehl, 1987). "When you look at a president's life I would guess upwards to 60 or 70 percent is spent toward what I would broadly call the advancement function." Presidents should embrace the opportunities that advancement provides for communicating the contributions and needs of higher education and their particular institution.

Due to the extremely heavy workload, efficient use of time is very important for advancement activities as well as other institutional needs. Presidents often do not have a hand in how they manage their time due to dictates by personal contacts, institutional priorities, and policies.

Many constituents want the attention of the chief executive who spends time speaking to organizations, attending alumni functions, answering mail, taking phone calls, and participating in a variety of other internal and external activities. "These options are available in such quantity that presidents could mistake accomplishing such activities for work which is more valuable, in terms of requiring presidential attention for which no subordinate could suffice" (Williamson, 1987).

College and university presidents should stay away from activities that are too time consuming or of low priority (Fisher, 1980b). It is better for the president and advancement vice president to be a little involved in numerous activities than to have considerable involvement in few activities. In seeking visibility, presidents should make key contacts and work to cultivate the greater public through speaking engagements to large audiences or through radio and television appearances.

Successful presidents should not personally take on projects, although they will generally receive the credit (Williamson, 1987). If theory is practiced, the president should be a party to highlights in each of the institutional advancement areas (Fisher, 1987). The president should be very visible without having to spend much time. Fisher (1987) contends:

> The idea is to keep the president active, alive, moving. To keep that white charger out there, but have the muscle come from the staff. The president shouldn't have to attend meetings often, or spend very

> much time at all in terms of non-public time. But in terms of public time, it should appear that the president is actually spending more time than actually he or she is, because of good staffing. It's a mistake for the president to sit at the entire board meeting of the alumni association. But the president ought to try to make every board meeting possible, give a brief inspiring report, answer any questions, and leave. That takes about 20 or 30 minutes of the president's time. Uninformed presidents and unsophisticated advancement officers believe the president should be at functions the entire time. That kills the president.

Proper delegation of work will yield an outcome of presidential capability to constituencies and appear as though the president does everything alone, a perception that one person realistically could not achieve (Williamson, 1987). It is standard practice for writers and project administrators to accept the behind-the-scenes role.

Presidents should concentrate their time on monitoring information, decision-making, recognizing and analyzing problems, and providing leadership for effective change, enhanced resources, and constituency morale.

While an open door policy may convey personable, flexible, and approachable characteristics of the chief executive, the policy is also an invitation to people who mistakenly believe that the sole person who can speak with authority for the college or university is the president.

Recommendations by Williamson (1987) to enhance presidential effectiveness include the following: 1) abolish the open door/mail/phone policy and develop a staff that is very familiar with the president's priorities. 2) The president's staff should be adept at screening to permit more presidential time for critical activities. Proper screening makes the president look available and concerned to constituencies.

Advancement Budget

The budget allocation for institutional advancement programs is extremely important to consider in order to accomplish goals and objectives (Willmer, 1981). "Without sufficient funds to perform advancement functions and without a reasonable return of gift dollars, institutional advancement suffers" (p. 74). No ideal percentage has been established for institutional advancement funding, although studies suggest that from four to eight percent of the total budget is being spent by small colleges for institutional advancement.

The position of the president in all college and university budget matters concerns the function and life of institutional advancement on the campus (Rowland, 1977). Without presidential support and participation, advancement efforts will be ineffective. The success of an institutional advancement program is reflected in budgets commensurate with the college's or university's commitment to advancement.

Willmer (1981) points out that for every twenty-five to forty cents spent in the advancement process, one dollar should be raised. Factors to be considered in these allocations include the number and skills of the advancement staff, geographic location, and the affluence of the constituencies.

Public Relations

Public relations at a college or university is the responsibility and "...objective of advancing understanding and support for the institution through programs designed to improve public confidence in the institution and to perform needed services" (Richards and Sherratt, 1981, p. 23). Public relations offices carry different titles, but generally include responsibilities for internal and external relations, print and broadcast news, media relations, public information, photography, publications, advertising, and special events.

"Public relations is a presidential responsibility" (Kinnison, 1977, p. 3). "It is of far greater importance today than before and no president dare give up his or her role in it."

Presidents must ensure that all institutional programs and activities directed to constituencies deal with the realities of economic, social, and political environments (Fram, 1979). Programs and activities must be consistent with the institutional image and foster the positive aspects of the college or university. Harral (1942, p. 263) relates that "a public relations program that emphasizes everything emphasizes nothing. A university cannot exert its best efforts along all lines."

Harral (1942, p. 260) also admonishes:

> Administrators must realize--and further, they must act in accordance with the realization--that newspaper publicity is not a cure-all for every disease that afflicts higher education, but is merely a method of giving an account of the stewardship of the institution to its supporting publics.

Internal and external relations are critical because institutions are dependent on public confidence and support. Internal and external relations entail reaching out to constituencies to "inform as well as to listen, to serve as well as to be of service" (Richards and Sherratt, 1981, p. 23).

A president's role in institutional advancement demands time for public appearances. "It is easy to be out of sight, and out of sight for too long becomes out of mind" (Rabbino, 1980, p. 33). By keeping track of the pulse of the institution, the president will learn when presence is required.

During interviews, Hilton (1985) recommends that presidents should be themselves, stay calm, bridge the conversation to get where they want to go, and be specific and accurate.

Shaw (1980) believes that internal constituencies should be informed of news and achievements on a weekly basis through a campus publication. Everyone at a college or university should feel they have an active role in improving the institution and special attention should be paid to internal constituencies during times of stress or crisis. That attention maintains credibility for institutional policy and permits morale to endure. Through personal and staff diplomacy, a president must work to keep balance and perspective (Rabbino, 1980).

Shaw (1980, p. 25) points out that:

> The president must communicate to all members of the institutional community their roles in communicating the public image of campus life to everyone with whom external contact is made. Public relations is everybody's responsibility--this dictum must be repeated constantly. The minute the student encounters the enrollment process, the image of the institution begins to take shape. The way registration is conducted, parking policies, student advisement and counseling, indeed the whole range of University service functions--all have an impact in strengthening

or weakening that image. A cumulative series of negative reinforcements on one individual student can do irreparable damage, as discontent spreads and everybody's capacity to believe the worst is confirmed.

Vigorous presidential leadership and prudent supervision by the advancement vice president are required to ensure that all public relations support units are coordinated and working toward meeting the institutional mission, as well as advancement team goals and objectives (Shaw, 1980).

While presidents do not have to talk to the media, it is more productive to have a positive relationship characterized by honesty and candid conversation. Presidents can discuss issues with media during lunch or dinner meetings, but many media will insist on paying their own way in order not to pose a conflict of interest. Most media practice their craft honestly and fairly, but outlaws do exist. One final rule is to never speak off the record. Reporters are not bound to off-the-record remarks initiated by the president.

By determining and capitalizing on a president's strengths, the institutional advancement team can develop a successful program for media coverage (Perkins, 1983). Methods to accomplish media attention include working with media in cities where the president is traveling, by awarding a presidential medal to people who exemplify the institution's ideals, and by having the president speak out on contemporary issues covered by the media. Presidents also receive media attention through joint ventures with other colleges and universities, as well as with private enterprise.

National coverage goes to presidents and institutions that seek national attention and have a viable product or information to share with target constituencies. National visibility must be an integral and realistic part of the advancement goals and objectives (Goldman, 1987). For many institutions, it is more realistic to concentrate on geographic areas closer to home. Considerable thought must go into what constitutes a national interest. Too often, presidents encourage their public relations staff to obtain national coverage on a program that essentially is no different from programs at other institutions. What makes a story newsworthy for a national audience includes the following: 1) The subject must be of national scope or impact. 2) The subject must be singularly unique and/or of contemporary interest.

Presidential support is needed to gain national media coverage, since a considerable increase in the travel budget will be necessary to makes contacts and place news stories (Goldman, 1987). Advancement staff members must hustle daily to identify potential news connections to the institution and its faculty. Contacts must be cultivated.

During sensitive or crisis situations, it is imperative that the president keep the public relations staff fully informed on matters as they occur. While plans for some emergency or crisis situations should be implemented in advance, presidents should be ready to make quick judgements. Presidents should also remember that the public relations staff are not magicians who can create illusions, but must constantly deal with reality (Rabbino, 1980).

Fisher (1984) advises that presidents speak at the peak of a crisis or emergency, informing the public relations staff in advance so they can handle the inquiries from the media and other constituencies. The president should have confidence that the public relations staff will be discreet, are team players, and "...will do all in their power to protect confidentiality and control timing" (Rabbino, 1980, p. 31).

Public interviews with media should be staged on the president's terms, but press conferences are not warranted unless media are willing to attend and believe content is newsworthy (Fisher, 1984). Live radio and television appearances are preferred "...unless you are assured of a sympathetic reporter" (Fisher, 1984, p. 150).

Developmental communications is an important aspect of the institutional advancement effort and it is important for presidents to establish a communications plan and translate the plan into the president's yearly communication schedule

(President's Ideajournal, 1982). An annual workshop should be held that involves all key decision makers at the college or university in order to obtain facts on what communication took place in the past year. This includes examining constituencies served, what kinds of activities were communicated, and how. Participants should then search for areas of improvement and address trends that may have an impact on the institution in the future. The final step is to develop a total institutional calendar of major activities requiring communications during the coming year. This calendar includes information on major activities. Communication components for an annual fund raising dinner, for example, could include pre-event news releases, television and radio interviews with the president, a speech by the president, inclusion of contributors' names in a dinner program and annual development report, and special recognition of donors at the dinner.

Conserving the president's time is a primary consideration which makes the communications plan an asset to the institution (President's Ideajournal, 1982). The president is able to review the communications calendar for the year, semester, month, week and day, enhancing the president's overall scheduling of meetings and activities. Proper scheduling permits a president to know priorities and determine what activities will be used to accomplish the institutional mission, goals, and objectives.

Fund Raising

Fund raising success in institutional advancement is based on presidential commitment, support, and leadership. The president must find the time for fund raising initiatives. Fisher (1985b, p. 50) writes that:

> The president personifies the institution. As the chosen leader, he or she is the one individual who must have a clearly defined vision for it. But to be successful, this vision must be communicated in such a way that the aspirations of the entire community are permanently altered. And the president must work to see that those heightened aspirations are not only understood but embraced by the trustees and regents. When the president's vision and aspirations become theirs, they not only adopt the same goals but accept responsibility for the outcomes. Forging this relationship is a vital ingredient to the success of the program and, indeed, of the presidency itself.

It is important to find a medium where the president is effective and comfortable in fund raising and not an extremist who avoids fund raising or wants to do everything alone (Francis, 1975). Contrary to some beliefs, the president is not the institution or bigger than the overall total of those persons served. Fund raising should be viewed by presidents as an entire concept of financing the institution, not an isolated entity for particular programs.

Francis (1980) states that proper delegation and a team effort in fund raising maximizes effectiveness. The team should include the president, institutional advancement vice president, advancement staff, interested trustees, faculty, and college or university friends who donate and solicit money for the institution.

Fund raising, according to Francis (1980, p. 66), "...is neither a dictating mechanism finding money for programs in which we should not be involved; nor is it an appendage tucked off in some corner to which we send messages like 'we need money, please find it'." Fund raising is not isolated from the college or university, but must be an integral part of the institutional mission, goals, and objectives supported by the entire advancement team. Goals should be understood and agreed upon.

> If the objectives are to have inspirational value, they must represent a blend of contributions from both the president and the development officer. If the objectives are no more than a laundry list drawn up by the president himself, there is apt to be less enthusiasm on the part of the development staff because it is the president's program, not their program..." (Francis, 1975, p. 2).

As with all components of institutional advancement, the president sets the tone and recommends directions. Whittier (1980, pp. 57-58) points out that:

> Most important, the president takes the lead in having those aspirations understood and adopted as their own by trustees and others critical to the future....Sound leadership inspires donor confidence. There is no substitute for donor confidence!....This confidence is based on their perception of the president. It is generated through word, deed, and stewardship. Prospective donors and volunteers want to hear what the president says, want to see the results and especially want to see how the president manages the affairs of the institution. Sound management, including the fiscal affairs, is receiving increasing attention from donors in all sectors....The president, more than anyone else, creates the climate in which fund raising takes place.

Brecher (1984) believes that an effective fund raising program involves a balanced triangle of the president, the number one volunteer and the development office staff. Presidents with little or no experience in how to raise funds should look to fund raising professionals and give those practitioners their full personal and professional confidence. This will allow the chief development officer to build on the strengths and background of the president and add a new dimension to the fund raising program.

College and university presidents need to motivate with direction, support and inspiration in all fund raising programs (Knoerle, 1975). It is important to properly select those professionals and volunteers who will lead institutional advancement activities. Presidents should be sure to follow-up with special, personal recognition.

It is crucial for a president to have the cooperation of all campus departments and have an idea of the responsibility of the governing board in a broad sense, particularly as it relates to advancement activities (Francis, 1975). The chief executive must see that the institution has something to sell, in addition to making sure members of the institution are continually monitoring and assessing themselves and the institution. Emphasis is placed on not over selling the institution, but on properly planning and carefully defining institutional needs. Presidents must ensure that the fund raising division has an adequate budget for travel and operations to properly solicit funds. Fund raising efforts should not, however, guide institutional priorities.

Asking for money or designating the right person to ask for money from a prospective donor is a presidential responsibility. Different circumstances require judgement calls as to who will do the institution's bidding--the president, the chief development officer, or an influential donor with a similar status and background. Fisher (1985, p. 51) notes:

> It always comes back to the president. The president is the person with the vision, who inspires donor confidence, who creates the climate in which the fund-raising activities take place. The ultimate responsibility for fund raising cannot be delegated to the staff, the board, or the foundation board. To believe otherwise is to indulge in an enormous self-delusion that will ultimately harm the institution.

Identification of persons with money, power, and in a position to assist a college or university is the first step in a fund raising program. The president must cultivate wealthy and influential citizens and work to become a member of that hierarchy to gain recognition as a community leader. Fisher (1985b) recommends that presidents conduct themselves with tact and decorum, not exhibiting discomfort among the local hierarchy and avoiding requests for favors by servile behavior. Unless the president knows the local citizens with influence and power, the advancement staff should prepare a background directory that includes a prospect's education, politics, family, and other pertinent facts. Knowing background information on prospective donors gives a president confidence in what should be a relaxed and problem-free first meeting. The process of establishing a strong relationship with a prospective donor includes a sincere interest in and attendance at public functions, concerts, lectures, sporting events, and other activities. Once a strong relationship has been established with a prospect, the president can begin to think about requesting a specific gift.

Presidents should have patience and perseverance in establishing the interest of prospective donors, media and others peripherally interested in the institution (Knoerle, 1975). All constituencies are affected by the president's lead, whether it is direct or indirect.

Meeting one-on-one with people in an informal and relaxed setting continues to be the best method of establishing good relationships. Excellent opportunities to meet with constituencies exist during meals. Presidents should generally extend breakfast and luncheon invitations and accept dinner invitations. Fisher (1985b, p. 55) notes "Until the president has become secure in his or her office, dinners will rarely attract the truly important people, and he or she will have wasted much valuable time and institutional money entertaining faculty, staff, and friends."

The president is the one individual who ultimately requests the big gifts and must have a vision that underlines a cause for giving (Quigg, 1986). Since people generally do not give without a cause, the president's chief responsibility is to design a cause that can be supported by constituencies and implemented by the fund raising staff.

Presidential expectations (Whittier, 1980) for fund raising efforts include 1) not being involved in activities that can be carried out by advancement professionals; 2) a complete presidential briefing prior to the activity, including the purpose of the function and background information on prospects; 3) follow-up details handled by advancement staff members, including letters prepared for the president's signature; 4) up-to-date information on changes in the status or involvement of prospects, fund raising leaders, and their gifts; and 5) a professional commitment by staff which ensures the president is effective and informed.

In any fund raising program, the president, advancement professionals, and other institutional executives should carefully review objectives to determine their interest in a project and its impact on the institution (Dunn, 1986). Other things to be considered include internal and external conflict of interest in a project, unwanted compromise with a political organization or special interest group, and the control of access to donors.

"The existence of a formal, written case statement characterizes overproductive fund-raising programs" (Pickett, 1984, p. 48). "The case statement shows potential donors that the college has a clear sense of its mission: where it has been, where it is, and where it wants to be."

Panas (1984) asserts that strong presidential leadership and a motivated staff are essential for fund raising success. Presidents should be bold, daring, and willing to ask for gifts. Panas insists that 1) individuals give emotionally, not cerebrally; 2) husbands and wives will discuss their major giving, making it essential for presidents to include spouses in appeals and activities; 3) people do not give to needs but to opportunities that are visionary, bold, and exhilarating; 4) people without experience in giving will almost never make a major gift; 5) people give because it feels good to give; 6) donors like to be recognized and appreciated in a sincere manner; and 7) people must have a compelling belief in the organization.

Presidents must be watchful against accepting gifts from private or government sources that compromise the governance of the institution (Bok, 1982). Presidents should also be alert to gifts that create ethical problems or with undesirable restrictions. A gift for research should not be accepted without discussion on the "... importance of the research findings to the donor, the degree of judgement or discretion involved in the study, and the extent to which the investigator's future support and financial well-being of the institution depend on the donor's continued good will" (Bok, 1982, p. 269). If it is determined that the institution will not accept a gift as described, the administration should decide how to avoid violating a scholar's academic freedom. Presidents should strive to work out other arrangements for funding to avoid lost credibility.

Gifts that potentially pose problems for colleges and universities are those from donors "...who have allegedly earned their money by immoral means or acted in ways that conflict with strongly held values in the community" (Bok, 1982, p. 270). Few institutions are reluctant to accept such funds and there is considerable difficulty in trying to establish policies and consistently apply those policies. If a college or university were to insist on a prior investigation of any potential donor, the institution would "needlessly deprive itself of substantial amounts of money that could be put to good use in providing scholarships, chairs, and buildings for educational purposes" (Bok, 1982, p. 271).

An institution must draw the line as to what gifts to accept or reject. Each case must be thoroughly discussed for its own merits since the acceptance of a donation does not simply endorse the actions and views of a donor.

Presidential time in fund raising should be utilized where it is most effective. Fund raising personnel should research, identify, and test markets to determine the top one percent of the college's or university's prospects. The top prospects "...should be diligently cultivated by the president in collaboration with key trustees and other volunteer leaders" (Francis, 1980, p. 71). Elite prospects include individuals, corporations, foundations, and religious organizations related to the institution. Overall results are what count in considering time commitments and efforts (Francis, 1975).

The president's role in the capital campaign is crucial to its success. McLaughlin (1984, p. 6) states: "...the success or failure of both a college and an administration--is in the short term--often judged on financial solvency. The fact that campaigns are measurable and many other achievements are not gives fund raising special, tangible significance." A president's leadership, institutional knowledge, and speaking ability have a positive impact on a college's or university's campaign (Grenzebach, 1984).

The president's role in the capital campaign is so vital to its success that without a president's special involvement, the program is destined to fail (Fazio and Fazio, 1984). The president must lead the way because the president knows best where the institution is headed. A campaign plan should not be a wish list, technical manual or secret formula. Fazio and Fazio (1984, p. 10) point out that:

> ...it is the best estimate of knowledgeable, experienced decision makers as to the scope, goals and objectives, process, and timelines of the campaign. It will include several checkpoints along the way as well

as a number of alternative scenarios that you must prepare in advance, just in case midcourse corrections become necessary.

Presidents should be involved in determining the feasibility of the campaign, formulating the case statement, validating the critical projects, and evaluating major prospects (Fazio and Fazio, 1984). An institution's volunteer leadership must sense a president's campaign commitment and the president must personally participate in major gift solicitation.

Campaigns provide an excellent opportunity to bring together a college's or university's constituencies for a common purpose. Beyond being a figurehead for the campaign the president must articulate needs, define goals, and establish priorities (McLaughlin, 1984). Of equal importance is calling on prospective donors and asking for contributions. An effective fund raising staff will assist the president in donor cultivation. For some fund raising staffs this may include coaxing, pressuring, and forcing a reluctant president into making major gift calls; scheduling trips a president may not want to make; and arranging meetings with individuals the president does not know and may not like.

McLaughlin (1984) points out that other areas of presidential involvement in the capital campaign include a basic knowledge of philanthropy; ensuring the development staff has the necessary skills in taxes, estate planning, life income trusts; assisting in the recruitment of volunteers; holding the professional staff accountable for meeting established benchmarks for success; and bringing together internal and external constituencies to support the campaign.

Successful campaigns are not individual efforts, but are well planned and coordinated efforts by many individuals. "That's why perhaps the most important thing you can do is remember to say 'thank you' when it's all over--and to say it not only to the givers but also to those who made it happen" (McLaughlin, 1984, p. 8).

Alumni Relations

One constituency often taken for granted by presidents is alumni. Fisher (1984, p. 173) believes that "...without a strong and positive base of alumni support, a president is bound to fail in virtually any effort to enhance his or her charismatic power."

Since alumni are a major audience of institutional advancement programs, Richards and Sherratt (1981) believe presidents must understand the unique nature of alumni activities and organizations to be effective with that constituency. Forman (1980, pp. 45-46) notes that:

> Alumni are volunteers. They serve their university out of a sense of loyalty, obligation, and devotion, but alumni productivity is dependent upon a variety of

> factors. It is important that alumni be involved within the advancement activities of an institution in a manner which provides for maximum flexibility and a degree of independent judgement....Alumni perceive themselves as institutional guardians, the safeguarders, even the watchdogs of the traditional quality and character of their university.

Presidents should accept and encourage those feelings in alumni to maximize interest and commitment. A president should understand that alumni desire their inputs to be important to the institution and want to be perceived "...as individuals whose support goes beyond their material resources" (Forman, 1980, p. 51).

Alumni programs provide affirmation to an institution's mission, goals and objectives and are determined by the following factors: "...type of institution, method by which alumni are organized, quality of faculty, type of student, geography, and market surveys" (Riechley, 1977, p. 304). Alumni programs include on and off-campus seminars, continuing education programs, cultural events, educational tours, and a host of other activities.

Stover (1930) stresses that the freshmen start the process of becoming an alumni on their first day of enrollment and the president "...should inaugurate some program of instruction of undergraduates in the rights and duties of alumni" (p. 114). Shaw (1930, p. 665-665) points out that colleges and universities have failed to a degree "...if the end of all things academic comes with the granting of the diploma. Commencement, instead of being the end, as it too often is, should be a continuation of the relationship in a new form." Alumni relations should stimulate and guide the affection of graduates and keep alive the spirit of the institution.

Government Relations

"Neglect of the government relations function has contributed to the present credibility gap between the higher education community and many elected and appointed government officials" (Vickrey, 1977, pp. 349-350). The gap has affected institutional accountability, as well as increasing the scrutiny of government appropriations and institutional activities.

Vickrey (1977, p. 351) points out three government relations objectives:

1. Ensuring that appropriate government officials and their staff have access to relevant and timely information and ideas about the operation of the institution.
2. Providing a coordinated method of efficiently communicating (within the constraints of applicable laws) to appropriate government officials and their staffs institutional concerns regarding past or

proposed government action. For public institutions, providing such communication channels is an inherent responsibility.

3. Ensuring that the appropriate internal and external groups and individuals are kept informed about and involved in relevant activities of the government affairs program.

Freelen (1980) writes that presidents leaving office agree that governmental relations played a significantly more important role in their administration than they had expected upon taking office. Since most institutions derive their legal status from public statute, no institution is immune from public examination. Government relations involves legislative and policy decisions enacted by elected or appointed officials. The most important characteristic for a president or other administrator involved with government relations is integrity.

> "The truth should never be shaved by omission or commission, and the unwritten rule among legislators, policy makers, and staff is that you only get one chance. Any breech of integrity will lead, next time, to your communication being ignored or, at best, being double checked with others" (Freelen, 1980, p. 77).

Presidential success in political arenas necessitates skill, knowledge, and commitment. Presidents must evaluate their actions in light of their impact on the total political situation. Sweet (1980, p. 42) insists that:

> As long as a college president is within reach of any communications medium that can send reports back to the political system, he or she must never speak or act in an unpresidential way. Living up to this standard requires extraordinary discipline, and is rarely achieved with complete success. The sensitivity of the political system to the behavior of those functioning within it demands nothing less of a college president who must also be a political leader.

Because state resources for public institutions far exceed funds from other sources, presidents and advancement professionals must "...recognize that the president's political success is more important than any other aspect of his or her institutional advancement work" (Sweet, 1980, p. 42). "Consequently all institutional advancement efforts must be viewed in terms of their impact on the institution's relationship with the state political system."

College and university presidents must first determine "...those governmental actions, or possible actions, that have, or can have an impact, positive or negative, on the institution and its ability to achieve its objectives" (Kennedy, 1986, p. 500).

Other presidential responsibilities in government relations (Freelen, 1980) include becoming as well acquainted as possible with state and federal legislators, inviting government officials and their staffs to the campus at least once a year, being accessible to the person you ask to direct the government relations program, and keeping trustees informed of the most important issues through meetings and occasional written or telephone follow-ups. Presidents should express thanks to government officials when it is deserved. "Most politicians have an accurate sense of how busy presidents are, so a timely, thoughtful note of appreciation from the president never goes unnoticed" (Freelen, 1980, p. 78).

To effectively achieve institutional goals and objectives through government relations activities, presidents should set priorities, accept trade-offs, and be reasonable in their institutional requests. Shaw (1980, p. 23) believes "readiness demands that we be able to articulate our needs in the most forceful fashion, with a persuasive outline of the consequences to the state and the region if they are not met."

While presidents and other executive officers carry out government relations activities, it is important to have a coordinated effort orchestrated by a government relations professional (Kennedy, 1986). Presidents should ensure their government relations staff is familiar with the technical processes of Congress since "...Congress has become one of the most important sources of institutional advancement as well as the most important source of limitations on institutional advancement" (Freelen, 1977, p. 375). Today representatives in Congress are involved in more than 300 programs concerned with public sources to higher education institutions. Legislation that has had an impact on colleges and universities include tax measures related to institutional giving, postal laws, privacy laws, employment, retirement, and lobbying. Government relations professionals should keep the president abreast of federal and state government trends, laws, and regulations in order for the president to implement government mandates and respond to institutional concerns.

When preparing the annual communications calendar, the president and government relations staff should assign institutional personnel to legislators according to background or related factors, plan breakfast meetings with legislators in small groups to learn about their concerns and to express institutional interest, and involve alumni and friends of the institution who communicate their concern about support for the institution (Vickrey, 1977). Government relations activities should be communicated to internal constituencies to ensure their potential contributions are not wasted. This often precludes an individual from acting alone or being inconsistent with institutional plans and policies. Due to the prevalence of lobbying activities, government relations coordinators should be careful to see that constituencies comply with the law.

Bernstein (1986) writes that most legislators know about the impact of higher education on the economics of the local area and the quality of life, but few know about an institution's impact on the state and region. Presidents should show how their institution actually contributes to the state and region by increasing the awareness of legislators. Legislators want better data provided to government officials, as well as annual briefings at state capitols. A partnership approach creates a more positive relationship and results in better access, focus on issues and needs, and enhanced dialogue between legislators and institutional officials. Legislators should be awakened to their leadership potential to guide higher education's contributions to the state.

Government relations professionals and legislators recommend that institutions 1) try to speak with one voice and not compete against one another, 2) know when to stay out of politics, 3) let legislators know about major achievements and show them how the state's money is being used, and 4) eliminate non-essential problems so they do not become a distraction (Mooney, 1988). The most important recommendation for college and university officials is that they should constantly build contacts with political officials and not just during the budget process.

Fisher (1985b) believes that politicians and public figures are among the easiest of constituencies to cultivate because their positions are subject to various public opinions and attitudes. Elected and appointed officials are also aware of the college or university president's access to the public. Fisher (1985b, p. 55) writes:

> Few members of a general assembly are influenced by the importance of a case to an institution or its president. However, if you present the case in terms of its importance to the public (the same people on whom the politicians depend), you will invariably win in the public arena. The key, then, is to gain the support and confidence of the general public.

Presidents should not contribute to political campaigns unless they use their own funds and contribute to both candidates (Fisher, 1984). Politicians and other public officials may be invited to campus activities and genuinely appreciate being introduced. Internal and external constituencies will be impressed that the president can draw such dignitaries.

Summary

The importance of the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement cannot be understated. Presidents must be proponents of institutional advancement and understand the importance of public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations as cornerstones to building constituency support and achieving the institutional mission.

Presidential vision and inspiration is the basis to establishing an institutional mission supported by goals and objectives that can be advanced by the advancement staff. The president and advancement team must be united for a common purpose, sharing the president's vision and working to fulfill the institutional mission. Prior to committing presidential time and energy to activities, programs should be evaluated to determine if the activities support the college or university mission and contribute to the goals and objectives of the institutional advancement program.

Appropriate presidential leadership in advancement is mandatory to meet the needs of internal and external constituencies.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter is divided into the following sections: population, instrumentation, description of the survey instrument, data analysis, and summary.

Population

The population for this study was more than 2,800 member institutions of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) as listed in the 1987 membership directory. CASE is an international association for institutional advancement professionals and an advocate of higher education.

Judgement and stratified random samples were taken from the population that was limited to four-year colleges and universities in the United States. The judgement sample comprised 23 members that were awarded medals by CASE in two categories of annual competition from 1985 to 1987. The judgement sample consists of outstanding institutional advancement programs recognized by independent judges representing corporations, foundations, electronic media producers, publishers, volunteer and educational institutions and associations, and CASE members.

Twenty-three institutions in the judgement sample were compared with 23 randomly selected and stratified member institutions. Overall, 46 institutions were surveyed.

Categories for the judgement sample include General Program Excellence, and the President and the Public. General Program Excellence winners were chosen from those institutions that clearly demonstrated their superiority in a cross-section of categories according to the following formula: two categories from the program areas of public and alumni relations; one category from financial support areas; and three categories from any of the remaining communication categories. The jury reviewed the categories in which an institution had won awards and assigned point values according to levels achieved.

The President and the Public category recognized outstanding use of an institution's president in the public relations program. The jury reviewed an overall program or special projects in which the president played a major part. The jury looked at program strategy, including goals and objectives; program/project implementation; and success of the program or project.

Institutions in the stratified random sample were selected to equal the number of schools in each institutional category (public, private independent, private religious), in addition to approximating the enrollment of colleges and universities in the judgement sample. The stratified sample was randomly selected without replacement so that each CASE-member institution had an equal and independent chance of being selected.

Instrumentation

Investigation of the study included descriptive research and data collected through telephone interviews with selected presidents and two survey instruments. Telephone interview questions and items on the survey instruments were designed to provide specific information in response to research questions.

Selected presidents who indicated on their questionnaire a willingness to be interviewed were telephoned by the author to obtain anecdotal information through structured questions concerning the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement. Presidents participating in telephone interviews were selected by the author's judgement to represent public, private independent, and private religious institutions.

The author developed pilot and final survey instruments after conversations with professionals engaged in institutional advancement and a review of similar instruments used in leadership, institutional advancement, and other studies.

Both survey instruments were field-tested by presidents and public information/relations directors at New Mexico State University, Eastern New Mexico University, New Mexico Highlands University, and Southern Utah State College. These individuals are knowledgeable about presidential leadership and/or institutional advancement.

The demographic survey instrument was mailed with a cover letter to public information/relations directors at each institution. The presidential survey instrument was mailed with a cover letter to the president of each institution. Each cover letter was written and signed by the author. A self-addressed return envelope was enclosed with each of the survey instruments. A copy of each cover letter and survey instrument are included in Appendix A.

Presidents and public information/relations directors who did not respond to the first mailing were telephoned by the author to encourage their participation. Respondents who did not reply after a phone call by the author were sent a second survey instrument and a cover letter that requested their support and completion of the instrument. A third and fourth phone call was made to nonrespondents to elicit their participation. Six presidents who had not responded were phoned by the author to request a telephone interview.

Description of the Survey Instrument

Telephone interview questions were structured to elicit information on the president's role in advancement, the impact of institutional advancement on the institutional mission and presidency, outstanding features of a president's advancement program, and anticipated changes in a president's advancement program. Additional questions were asked by the author to clarify and expand a president's answers or to obtain information on a specific program.

The demographic survey instrument requested information on the type of institution and enrollment, as well as the number and type of professionals working in areas of institutional advancement. The instrument also requested the total annual 1987-88 budget for each of the advancement areas and the institution, staff sizes, and the amount of funds raised in 1986-87 through advancement.

Questions on the president's survey instrument concerned the importance a president places on the role of the president in institutional advancement, advancement areas strengths and weaknesses, and the characteristic traits of advancement staff. Other questions on the president's survey instrument concerned institutional advancement communication, planning, presidential involvement, and prior presidential experience in advancement activities.

Data Analysis

The data of the surveys were coded and entered onto a computer data file using programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Statistical techniques used to analyze the data include frequency and mean difference testing.

Summary

The problem for this study was to investigate how college and university presidents perceive the role of the president in institutional advancement. The study identified the extent presidents are involved in advancement, characteristic traits of professional advancement staff, and advancement areas strengths and weaknesses. The investigation also concerned institutional advancement communication, planning and demographic data. The population studied was selected from member institutions in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Judgement and stratified random samples were taken from a population that was limited to four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter provides information gathered through descriptive research and data collected through interviews with selected presidents and two survey instruments. Presidents who were interviewed include Martin G. Abegg of Bradley University, Steven C. Beering of Purdue University, Carroll W. Brewster of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Richard M. Cyert of Carnegie-Mellon University, Catherine Dunn of Clarke College, James B. Holderman of the University of South Carolina-Columbia, Theodore L. Hullar (chancellor) of the University of California-Davis, George W. Johnson of George Mason University, and Richard D. Remington of the University of Iowa. Major chapter sections are: Demographic Information, Presidential Leadership, Advancement Strategy, Relationship With Trustees, Planning, Staffing, Advancement Budget, Public Relations, Fund Raising, Alumni Relations, Government Relations, The Future of Institutional Advancement, and Summary.

Demographic Information

Forty-six colleges and universities were surveyed with responses provided by twenty-eight presidents for a response rate of 60.9 percent. Complete survey responses were returned by twenty-seven institutions for a response rate of 58.7 percent. Of the respondents, eleven (39.3 percent) were from the judgement sample and seventeen (60.7 percent) were from the stratified random sample. Seventeen (60.7 percent) of the respondents were from public institutions, while five (17.9 percent) were private independent colleges and universities. Six respondents (21.4 percent) were presidents at private religious institutions. Eighty-two percent (twenty-three) of the presidents indicated on their questionnaire a willingness to be interviewed. The twenty-eighth respondent was a president at a public institution from the judgement sample. That respondent did not return a questionnaire, but was interviewed by the author.

Table 1

Responding Institutions by
Stratified Sample and Category

	N	Percentage
Judgement		
Public	8	28.6
Private Independent	1	3.6
Private Religious	2	7.1
Random		
Public	9	32.1
Private Independent	4	14.3
Private Religious	4	14.3
N=28		

The author utilized initial sampling procedures with written and verbal follow-up techniques, but approximately 24 percent (eleven) of the total sample of presidents requested not to participate in the study because of extensive travel schedules, intensive fund raising projects, and commitments to other campus activities. Nearly 64 percent (seven) of the nonrespondents were from the judgement sample, while 36.4 percent (four) were from the random sample. Six (33.3 percent) of the nonrespondents were called by the author to schedule an interview. Five (83.3 percent) of those presidents declined due to heavy work schedules.

Table 2

Institutions Declining to Participate
Due to Busy Schedules by
Stratified Sample and Category

	N	Percentage
Judgement		
Public	2	18.2
Private Independent	3	27.3
Private Religious	2	18.2
Random		
Public	2	18.2
Private Independent	2	18.2
Private Religious	0	
N=11		

Packard (1988) has indicated that the limiting characteristics of the populations would justify a return rate much lower than normally acceptable. When considering the extent of the population universe, and in this case, the use of acceptable follow-up procedures, any rate of return over 40 percent could be considered justifiable when compared to other studies of this nature.

Substantial increases in nonresponse rates have occurred since the early 1950's (Steeh, 1981) due to respondent refusals, over exposure to the survey process, disillusionment with results, and confidentiality concerns.

Refusals have accounted for approximately 86 percent of the nonresponse for consumer attitudes and 85 percent for election studies.

Ross (1963, p. 272) points out that accessibility to respondents is a problem because of respondent work schedules and "gatekeepers" who prevent researchers from reaching sample respondents. "Gatekeepers" are often multiple and include secretaries, administrative assistants, and others.

Research by Donald (1960) indicates that early respondents tend to feel there is an interest in their viewpoint. Some evidence suggests that respondents who are more actively involved will reach a better understanding about what is happening in the organization than those less involved. McDonagh and Rosenblum (1965) found that mail questionnaire data could be considered representative of the population despite the limitation of the partial return of the selected sample. The researchers found no significant difference between respondents to mailed questionnaires, respondents to an interview who answered the questionnaire, and respondents to an interview who did not answer the questionnaire.

Presidents who did answer the questionnaire have been in their current position an average of six years. Twelve presidents (43 percent) have been chief executive officers at other institutions, while nine respondents (32 percent) are former vice presidents and five (18 percent) were deans. One respondent (4 percent) held a chaired professorship, while another respondent (4 percent) was a special advisor.

Two (7 percent) of the presidents held a vice presidency in institutional advancement before assuming their current position. Twelve (44.4 percent) of the participating presidents had no prior experience or training in institutional advancement. Nine (33.3 percent) of the presidents had training or experience in each of the advancement areas--public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations. One (3.7 percent) chief executive officer had experience or training in public relations and government relations, while two presidents (7.4 percent) had training or experience in public relations, fund raising, and government relations. One president (3.7 percent) had training or experience in public relations, alumni relations, and government relations. One CEO (3.7 percent) had training or experience only in public relations, while another president (3.7 percent) had training or experience only in fund raising.

Table 3

Presidential Experience or Training in Institutional Advancement

Advancement Area	N	Percentage
Public Relations, Fund Raising, Alumni Relations, and Government Relations	9	33.3
Public Relations and Government Relations	1	3.7
Public Relations, Fund Raising, and Government Relations	2	7.4
Public Relations, Alumni Relations, and Government Relations	1	3.7
Public Relations	1	3.7
Fund Raising	1	3.7
No Experience	12	44.4

N=27

Presidential Leadership

Presidential interviews indicate that the college or university president plays a critical role in institutional advancement. Martin G. Abegg (1988), president of Bradley University, believes "the president's primary responsibility is to place the best face forward for the institution. To do that the president must represent the institution on and off campus as honestly and ethically as possible."

Richard M. Cyert (1988), president of Carnegie-Mellon University, cites the following:

> The president, in contrast to the deans, looks at the institution in totality whereas others tend to look at the institution in terms of parts. The provost should also be looking at it that way, except that the provost tends to just look at the academic side of it. The president must look at the role in the community; the way in which education and research take place; and the way in which the institution, whether public or private, relates to the state and federal government. There's a broad range of dimension. There is no dimension of the university that the president should not be aware of and take into account. This means the president should get to know the relevant players....

Institutional advancement is a major portion of the presidency for Catherine Dunn of Clarke College. Dunn (1988) emphasizes:

> In the advancement area the president has got to be out in the public being a spokesperson for the college, being a leader that's visible. If there's anything missing in our institutions today it's visible leadership at the presidency. I think presidents should be more involved in advancement and have shied away from it because it's not familiar territory to them. Presidents should immerse themselves...

The president sits at the head of all institutional tables, including the advancement table, leading discussions. At the point where decisions have been made, operational responsibility falls in the hands of the institutional advancement vice president and the advancement staff. The president does continue to play a vital role with constituencies because, according to Theodore L. Hullar (1988), chancellor of the University of California-Davis, "...the question people ask is where is the chancellor [president]? What does the chancellor think? People want to see the CEO. They want to know the commitment is really there. They want to hear it in the tone of the voice."

Purdue University President Steven C. Beering (1988) notes:

> I view this like a corporate job. In addition to being the CEO of this major enterprise, my job as manager is to be a pacesetter, orchestra conductor and cheerleader. The president must believe advancement is important and must get out front and show by his own personal commitment and presence that he wants everybody else to be on the team. I think the kinds of things you can delegate for something of this magnitude are the administrative and logistic details, the mechanical aspects of it. You can have a lot of people get ready for the meeting, but if the president doesn't show up it just falls flat on its face. I obviously

> have had to cancel meetings on occasions...and I can tell you the backlash has been immediate and strong.... So given those realities, I feel the president has to be personally involved and up front about it.

College and university presidents share a common belief that their role in institutional advancement has an impact on their presidency. According to Cyert (1988), "I think that if I weren't doing this I wouldn't be doing my job properly."

Beering (1988) states:

> I hope it's going to help others who look at the university from whatever vantage point to feel that the university has a direction; is acting on its convictions; and that the president communicates that message repeatedly, constantly, forcefully, and articulately. And that in fact he has brought others around to that view and that they are all reading from the same hymn sheet and are making understandable noises together. One reality and one of the reasons that some CEO's of universities shy away from this is that it means you are really doing an extra job and your free time is gone. I literally spend every evening and every weekend related to alumni, to the community, to advancement efforts. So does my wife. It's a team effort. We are on the road all the time. In order to still manage the university; have staff

> meetings; meet with the deans, vice presidents, and the chancellors; and deal with the budget, personnel issues, the legislature at both national and state levels; that means that you do these other things by and large at night and on weekends.

Eighty-four percent (twenty-two) of the presidents responding to the open-ended survey question "What do you believe is the basic function of the president in institutional advancement?" answered leadership; participation; motivation and encouragement; articulation of goals, policies, and direction; and strategically positioning the institution. Sixteen percent (four) of the presidents indicated their basic function was soliciting gifts.

Presidents agree that the rationale for the president's function is that institutional advancement must be a central priority for a college or university. The president is a role model and the only campus individual who has a total view of the institution. A president must clearly communicate the value and characteristics of institutional advancement to constituencies.

Nearly forty-six percent (eleven) of the presidents responding to the open-ended survey question "What do you consider the most outstanding feature of your college's or university's institutional advancement program?" stated fund raising. Seven respondents (29.2 percent) noted personal attention to constituencies, a game plan, and team effort. Public relations communication had a 15.4 percent (four) response. Approximately four percent (one) of the presidents indicated institutional academic integrity was the outstanding feature of the advancement program, while another 4.2 percent (one) pointed to the data base.

Hullar (1988) believes that the University of California-Davis has had a tradition of high quality relationships with constituencies and insists that relationship must continue. "I also believe the results in the advancement area, irrespective of which of the four dimensions we're looking at, are dependent on trust and respect that occurs on a one-on-one basis, a person-to-person basis."

Nearly eighty-nine percent (twenty-four) of the presidents rated their involvement as high in public relations, while 85.2 percent (twenty-three) of the presidents rated their involvement as high in the overall institutional advancement program. Sixty-three percent (seventeen) of the presidents have a high involvement in fund raising with 59.3 percent (sixteen) indicating a high involvement in government relations. Approximately 62 percent (sixteen) noted a moderate involvement in alumni relations.

Table 4

How Presidents Rate Their
Involvement in Specific Programs
(N/Percentage)

Advancement Areas	High	Moderate	Low
Public Relations	24 88.9	3 11.1	0
Fund Raising	17 63.0	9 33.3	1 3.7
Alumni Relations	8 30.8	16 61.5	2 7.7
Government Relations	16 59.3	9 33.3	2 7.4
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	23 85.2	4 14.8	0

When presidents were asked how much involvement they desire in institutional advancement programs, 84.6 percent (twenty-two) desired a high involvement in the overall program, 74.1 percent (twenty) wanted a high involvement in public relations, 73.1 percent (nineteen) desired a high involvement in fund raising, and 65.4 percent (seventeen) wanted active participation in government relations. Presidents were split toward their involvement in alumni relations with 46.2 percent (twelve) desiring moderate involvement and 42.3 percent (eleven) desiring a high involvement.

Table 5

How Much Involvement Presidents Desire
in Institutional Advancement Programs
(N/Percentage)

Advancement Areas	High	Moderate	Low
Public Relations	20 74.1	6 22.2	1 3.7
Fund Raising	19 73.1	7 26.9	0
Alumni Relations	11 42.3	12 46.2	3 11.5
Government Relations	17 65.4	8 30.8	1 3.8
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	22 84.6	4 15.4	0

College and university presidents had an opportunity to determine their two strongest and weakest programs in institutional advancement. Forty-eight percent (thirteen) of the presidents consider their overall institutional advancement program their strongest, while 44.4 percent (twelve) of the presidents marked fund raising. Forty-one percent (eleven) of the CEO's indicated public relations was the strongest program. Alumni relations was considered the weakest advancement program by 59.3 percent (sixteen) of the respondents.

Table 6

Programs Presidents Consider the Strongest and Weakest at Their Institution (N/Percentage)

Advancement Area	Strongest	Weakest
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	13 48.1	3 11.1
Public Relations	11 40.7	3 11.1
Fund Raising	12 44.4	4 14.8
Alumni Relations	3 11.1	16 59.3
Government Relations	8 29.6	10 37.0

Advancement Strategy

Presidents who were interviewed agree that an advancement strategy is important. President George W. Johnson (1988) of George Mason University points out that he is a strategist "...looking for advantage, to exploit the terrain, the high ground. We have to continue to own the hearts and minds of constituencies. We have to be the object of pride."

"When you as an individual alumnus get a message from the university and repeated mailings that are inconsistent, you're going to be turned off," insists Beering (1988).

> My theme has been 'Investment in People' for the whole time I've been here. I can't ever see changing that. We have used that theme in everything we've done in advancement. We invest in undergraduate and graduate students at the scholarship level. We invest in faculty at the professorship level. If we ask for capital or equipment it is to buttress the teaching effort related to people. Everything is related to making better people for the future of this nation, for themselves, for the community, for international programs, whatever. That's been a very important message which has hit very receptive ears. We've all had that message and it's been consistent. If we had a

> different message, we'd have a credibility gap. If somebody, for example, were to get up in the school of science and say 'we understand the development office or president have said what we need is investment in people, but that's nonsense. What we need is a new laboratory.' Then we have created a credibility gap. When you have a credibility gap you find that people stop writing checks. They are less interested if there isn't a perceived dynamic forward progress which is built upon a consensus that is broadly shared. Once you have constituencies in the fold and they read your publications and they come to your meetings, then you have an audience to whom you can give your message. Until you can do that you're talking to yourself. So the team effort is absolutely essential.

Presidential visions for institutional advancement programs at their colleges and universities vigorously encompass many facets and constituencies. Hullar (1988) states that "advancement should be a highly effective, integral part of our overall program, just as any other campus unit." Hullar believes in accurately portraying the institution, communicating that image to constituencies, and making the concept work for the institution in terms of constituency support. Advancement should be a service to the campus community.

Beering's (1988) vision for institutional advancement parallels the vision of the university.

> We want to move into the twenty-first century at the head of the line as an international institution known for its research and graduate education and for its strong mix of liberal arts and science programs on the undergraduate level. We want to be a force for economic development and be service oriented with the many talents we have to bring to that.

Presidents assert that their role has a positive impact on achieving their institutional mission. University of Iowa President Richard D. Remington (1988) believes "...in constantly keeping the university mission before the general public," while Johnson (1988) notes that presidents have a high profile and must become community leaders to position their institutions for constituency support.

"Again, the Purdue advancement effort is a team effort" (Beering, 1988). "Each of us is striving for the same goal on the horizon and we ask how we can help each other."

"I like to think in strategic terms" (Hullar, 1988). "I like to think about complex matters, what various parties of interest are involved in situations, how they relate to each other, and the best way of relating all of them to address a special issue."

All of the survey respondents believe the importance of the role of the president in public relations and the overall institutional advancement program is high in order to be successful with constituencies. Eighty-five percent (twenty-three) note a high importance in fund raising with 77.8 percent (twenty-one) of the respondents indicating a high importance of the president in alumni relations. Sixty-three percent (seventeen) of the respondents noted a high importance of the president in government relations.

Table 7

Importance of the Role of the President in Advancement Programs for the Institution to be Successful with Constituencies (N/Percentage)

Advancement Area	High	Moderate	Low
Public Relations	27 100.0		
Fund Raising	23 85.2	4 14.8	
Alumni Relations	21 77.8	6 22.2	
Government Relations	17 63.0	10 37.0	
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	27 100.0		

A high degree of success is expected by 88.9 percent (twenty-four) of the presidents in public relations, 85.2 percent (twenty-three) of the CEO's in the overall advancement program, and 74.1 percent (twenty) of the presidents fund raising. Sixty-three percent (seventeen) of the presidents expect a high degree of success in alumni relations, while 59.3 percent (sixteen) of the presidents expect high success in government relations.

Table 8

Degree of Success Presidents Expect in Institutional Advancement Areas

Advancement Areas	High	Moderate	Little or None
Public Relations	24 88.9	3 11.1	
Fund Raising	20 74.1	7 25.9	
Alumni Relations	17 63.0	9 33.3	1 3.7
Government Relations	16 59.3	10 37.0	1 3.7
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	23 85.2	4 14.8	

Relationship With Trustees

The relationship a president has with trustees is dependent upon the type of institution, public or private, in addition to the degree that presidents encourage participation and that trustees desire to be involved. Presidents and trustees generally have more of an active working relationship, while trustees play a supportive role in advancement at public institutions (Holderman, 1988).

Dunn (1988) encourages presidents to have a close working relationship with trustees in the advancement program. Dunn states:

> Once trustees become involved in that sense, they will place a little more emphasis in the advancement area....The presidents hired today, whether for public or private institutions, have got to be visible leaders. Trustees must look for someone who is willing to be out in the public arena. Trustees should basically look for more extroverted rather than scholarly introverted people, which is the way we looked previously for leaders of institutions. At public institutions, you better have somebody in there who can relate well to legislators, public officials, and businessmen because more and more public institutions are moving into private fund raising. Every one of our trustees made a commitment to our capital campaign and were the first ones to contribute.

> They all work in the capital campaign in committees or as solicitors. I make the contacts with them and they go with me to make calls.

Planning

Planning plays a prominent role in institutional advancement for all of the respondents who were interviewed. James B. Holderman (1988), president of the University of South Carolina-Columbia, relates the president:

> ...is the pacesetter, the man who puts the blueprints up on the wall and says here is what we've got to achieve. How can a university move without it? I expect people will hold my feet to the fire if we don't achieve our objectives and be helpful and laudatory if we do.

Cyert stresses strategic planning in all of the advancement areas at Carnegie-Mellon University. "The people now in charge of these operations; government, alumni, development, public relations; do think in terms of strategy" (Cyert, 1988). Cyert explains:

> They develop strategic plans and I go over them. In the public relations areas, I not only go over the total strategy and talk to the group when they go away for a retreat, but I meet on a regular basis with the director of public relations so that we try to handle both short run and long run public relations.

Beering (1988) believes that administrators should take the time and effort to study their institutional advancement program. He asserts:

> This is an ongoing built-in activity that every institution has to undertake whether it is a corporation, a university, or a volunteer organization. It shouldn't be focused on money, but focused on programatic endeavors for the entire university. It ought to be a two-way street where you get input from your constituencies in terms of your programatic modifications that will keep the institution at the cutting edge. We need to be in touch with constituency.

Carroll W. Brewster, president of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, explains that the president should chair the planning committee since the advancement strategy will ultimately be the document to which the president is committed. Brewster (1988) states:

> First my role is to develop and enlarge an interior constituency for the plan so there is general consensus that we are going in the right direction. Every institution has limited resources. We do. The carrying out of the plan will involve the infusion of exterior funds, but will also involve a reallocation of how we spend our own money. The development of a consensus along that line for an academic institution

is complicated. Any such plan has to be a developing thing that is not just cast in stone. I think everyone expects the institution to move forward and cope with current problems effectively and improve itself. Having developed a pretty good interior consensus, my next job is to bring the board of trustees into this so they can be involved during the course of the year in which planning is going on. And finally to announce the plan and go out and get the resources to make it happen. Our board will be brought into this planning process early on, particularly through its leadership. I think it is important that they have some document or some plan that was developed internally to react to so that they aren't just coming in without any set of parameters. During the course of the year of planning the board will be involved first through its leadership and then through extensive sessions with the internal committees so that they become involved with the plan and are completely committed to it. Without their commitment, we can't carry it out.

The degree to which goals and objectives are based on the institutional mission and clearly defined is high for 77.8 percent (twenty-one) of the presidents in fund raising and 74.1 percent (twenty) of the CEO's in public relations. Approximately seventy percent (nineteen) of the respondents noted the degree to which goals and objectives are based on the institutional mission and clearly defined as high for government relations programs, followed by 66.7 percent (eighteen) in the overall program and 59.3 percent (sixteen) in alumni relations.

Table 9

Degree to which Goals and Objectives are Based on the Institutional Mission and Clearly Defined (N/Percentage)

Advancement Area	High	Moderate	Low
Public Relations	20 74.1	5 18.5	2 7.4
Fund Raising	21 77.8	6 22.2	
Alumni Relations	16 59.3	8 29.6	3 11.1
Government Relations	19 70.4	7 25.9	1 3.7
Overall Institutional Advancement Program	18 66.7	8 29.6	1 3.7

Nearly fifty-six percent (fifteen) of the presidents annually establish long-range goals and objectives with the advancement staff, while 25.9 percent (seven) go through the procedure biannually.

Table 10

Frequency in which the President Establishes Long-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	2	7.4
Monthly	1	3.7
Biannually	7	25.9
Annually	15	55.6
Every two or more years	2	7.4
Never	0	
N=27		

Forty-four percent (twelve) of the respondents annually review long-range goals and objectives with the advancement staff and 37 percent (ten) conduct biannual reviews.

Table 11

Frequency in which the President Reviews Long-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	3	11.1
Monthly	1	3.7
Biannually	10	37.0
Annually	12	44.4
Every two or more years	1	3.7
Never	0	
N=27		

The frequency in which the president establishes short-range goals and objectives with the institutional advance staff is monthly for 63 percent (seventeen) and weekly for 18.5 percent (five).

Table 12

Frequency in which the President Establishes
Short-range Goals and Objectives
with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	5	18.5
Monthly	17	63.0
Biannually	2	7.4
Annually	2	7.4
Every two or more years	1	3.7
Never	0	
N=27		

Presidents also review short-range goals and objectives with advancement staff members on a monthly basis 66.7 percent (eighteen) of the time and on a weekly basis 18.5 percent (five) of the time.

Table 13

Frequency in which the President Reviews Short-range Goals and Objectives with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	5	18.5
Monthly	18	66.7
Biannually	1	3.7
Annually	2	7.4
Every two or more years	1	3.7
Never	0	
N=27		

Tracking of advancement progress by presidents is monthly for 55.6 percent (fifteen) of the respondents and weekly for 33.3 percent (nine).

Table 14

Frequency in which the President Tracks Advancement Progress with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	9	33.3
Monthly	15	55.6
Biannually	1	3.7
Annually	2	7.4
Every two or more years	0	
Never	0	
N=27		

Presidents indicate they involve other offices in advancement activities with the institutional advancement staff on a weekly basis 37 percent (ten) of the time, on a monthly basis 29.6 percent (eight) of the time, and biannually or every two or more years 11.1 percent (three) of the time.

Table 15

Frequency in which the President Involves Other Offices in Advancement Activities with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	10	37.0
Monthly	8	29.6
Biannually	3	11.1
Annually	3	11.1
Every two or more years	3	11.1
Never	0	
N=27		

The frequency in which the president conducts research in institutional advancement that relates to constituencies is as follows: 28 percent (seven) on an annual basis, 20 percent (five) on a weekly basis, and 16 percent (four) on a monthly, biannual, or every two or more years basis.

Table 16

Frequency with which the President Conducts Research with the Institutional Advancement Staff that Relates to Constituencies

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	5	20.0
Monthly	4	16.0
Biannually	4	16.0
Annually	7	28.0
Every two or more years	4	16.0
Never	1	4.0
N=25		

Presidents biannually communicate institutional plans to faculty and staff 44.4 percent (twelve) of the time, 22.2 percent (six) of the time on an annual basis, and 18.5 percent (five) of the time on a weekly basis.

Table 17

Frequency in which the President Communicates Plans to Faculty and Staff Through the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	5	18.5
Monthly	4	14.8
Biannually	12	44.4
Annually	6	22.2
Every two or more years	0	
Never	0	
N=27		

Respondents indicate they offer advancement services to faculty and staff on a weekly basis 40.7 percent (eleven) of the time and on an annual basis 25.9 percent (seven) of the time. Approximately nineteen percent (five) offer services biannually.

Table 18

Frequency in which the President Offers Advancement Services to Faculty and Staff with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	11	40.7
Monthly	3	11.1
Biannually	5	18.5
Annually	7	25.9
Every two or more years	1	3.7
Never	0	
N=27		

Presidents encourage faculty and staff to participate in advancement activities on an annual or monthly basis 29.2 percent (seven) of the time and on a weekly basis 25 percent (six) of the time.

Table 19

Frequency in which the President Encourages Faculty and Staff to Participate in Advancement Activities with the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	6	25.0
Monthly	7	29.2
Biannually	4	16.7
Annually	7	29.2
Every two or more years	0	
Never	0	
N=24		

Staffing

The importance of a competent advancement staff could not be understated by the presidents who were interviewed. Hullar (1988) notes "if you don't have quality staff, you don't advance. To me it's unconscionable, for almost moral reasons, to have an inadequate staff. I think it dooms your enterprise to poor or less than adequate results."

The presidents who were interviewed agreed that communication with the advancement staff was very important with Hullar, Abegg, and Beering anticipating an increase in the staff to meet advancement team and institutional needs in the future.

Beering (1988) sets high standards to reach high achievement. He is convinced that presidents who take the stance that the institution should have an advancement program because everyone else has one is really not committed. As a result, the effort by the advancement staff is also less than a full commitment required for success. Beering seeks professionals who are tied to institutional advancement "...with a vengeance and a mission." The president and advancement vice president spend a considerable amount of time on the road working with constituencies. They travel together and are accompanied by their spouses. "Whatever it is we are constantly at it. That's what I mean by setting high expectations of yourself, of the office, for the university, for everybody else. It's contagious. People catch on and they participate."

All twenty-seven of the presidents specified that initiative and twenty-six (96.3 percent) of the CEO's noted professional competence were characteristics that were very important in their professional staff. From 88.9 to 92.6 percent (twenty-four to twenty-five) of the presidents indicated creativity, interpersonal skills, effectiveness in dealing with constituencies, and responsibility as being very important characteristics. Seventy to 77.8 percent (nineteen to twenty-one) of the presidents indicated tact, frankness in dealing with others, and cooperation were very important qualities of professional staffers in advancement.

Table 20

The Importance of Characteristics
Valued by Presidents in
their Professional Staff

Characteristics	Very	Somewhat	Not	Negative
Initiative	27			
	100.0			
Creativity	24	3		
	88.9	11.1		
Professional competence	26	1		
	96.3	3.7		
Aggressiveness	16	9	2	
	59.3	33.3	7.4	
Interpersonal skills	24	3		
	88.9	11.1		
Influence with those in power	4	18	3	2
	14.8	66.7	11.1	7.4
Cooperation	21	5	1	
	77.8	18.5	3.7	

Table 20 (continued)

Characteristics	Very	Somewhat	Not	Negative
Support from faculty	7 25.9	19 70.4	1 3.7	
Competitiveness	8 29.6	14 51.9	5 18.5	
Tact	19 70.4	7 25.9	1 3.7	
Effectiveness in dealing with constituencies	25 92.6	2 7.4		
Personal ambition	5 19.2	16 61.5	3 11.5	2 7.7
Salesmanship	10 37.0	13 48.1	4 14.8	
Frankness in dealing with others	20 74.1	6 22.2	1 3.7	
Responsibility	25 92.6	1 3.7	1 3.7	

Frequent sources of reliance by presidents for information in advancement areas are personal conversation with advancement staff 85.2 percent (twenty-three) of the time and meetings 70.4 percent (nineteen) of the time. Seventy-four percent (twenty) of the presidents occasionally rely on formal reports for advancement information.

Table 21

Presidential Source Reliance
for Information in Institutional
Advancement Areas
(N/Percentage)

Source	Frequency	Occasionally	Seldom or Never
Meetings	19 70.4	7 25.9	1 3.7
Personal conversations with advancement staff	23 85.2	4 14.8	
Memoranda	9 33.3	12 44.4	6 22.2
Formal reports	2 7.4	20 74.1	5 18.5
Through faculty and staff	4 14.8	11 40.7	12 44.4

Professional staff for institutions with less than five thousand students averaged three in public relations, 3.3 in fund raising, and 1.3 in alumni relations. These schools did not have government relations professional staff.

Colleges and universities with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999 averaged nine public relations and fund raising professionals, three alumni professionals, and one government relations professional.

An average of 16.5 public relations and fund raising professionals are employed by schools with an enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999, while the average alumni relations staff totals four. Government relations professionals averaged 1.3 staff members.

Professional personnel for institutions with more than twenty thousand students averaged 24.4 in public relations, 29.8 in fund raising, 8.4 in alumni relations, and two in government relations.

Table 22

1987-1988 College or University Professional Staff by Enrollment and Institutional Advancement Area

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000			
Public Relations	10	3.0	1-5
Fund Raising	10	3.3	1-7
Alumni Relations	10	1.3	1-2
Government Relations	0		
5,000-9,999			
Public Relations	7	9.0	1-5
Fund Raising	7	9.0	1-31
Alumni Relations	6	3.0	1-8
Government Relations	3	1.0	1
10,000-19,999			
Public Relations	4	16.5	7-15
Fund Raising	4	16.5	5-38
Alumni Relations	4	4.0	1-6
Government Relations	3	1.3	1-2
Over 20,000[a]			
Public Relations	5	24.4	11-36
Fund Raising	5	29.8	6-71
Alumni Relations	5	8.4	4-12
Government Relations	5	2.0	1-2

[a] Figures for one institution have been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figures/median are as follows: public relations, 11/22.0; fund raising, 2/19.5; alumni relations, 2/8.0; and government relations, 0/2.0.

Colleges and universities with less than five thousand students averaged one public relations support staff, three support staff in fund raising, and one support staff in alumni. No support staff were reported for government relations.

The average support staff figures for institutions with 5,000 to 9,999 students are as follows: three in public relations, seven in fund raising, two in alumni relations, and one in government relations.

Schools with an enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999 students report an average of four support staff in public relations, 17.8 in fund raising, five in alumni relations, and one in government relations.

An average of eight support staff in institutions with more than twenty thousand students work in public relations, with thirty employed in fund raising. An average of fifteen support staff are in alumni programs with an average of one support staff assigned to government relations.

Table 23

1987-1988 College or University Support Staff by Enrollment and Institutional Advancement Area

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000			
Public Relations	10	1.0	1-2
Fund Raising	10	3.0	1-9
Alumni Relations	10	1.0	1-2
Government Relations	0		
5,000-9,999			
Public Relations	7	3.0	1-9
Fund Raising	7	7.0	1-19
Alumni Relations	5	2.0	1-5
Government Relations	1	1.0	1
10,000-19,999			
Public Relations	4	4.0	2-6
Fund Raising	4	17.8	7-46
Alumni Relations	4	5.0	3-7
Government Relations	3	1.3	1-2
Over 20,000[a]			
Public Relations	5	8.0	3-12
Fund Raising	5	30.0	3-36
Alumni Relations	5	15.0	3-19
Government Relations	5	1.0	1

[a] Figures for one institution have been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figures/median are as follows: public relations, 3/8.5; fund raising, 1/28.0; alumni relations, 1/12.0; and government relations, 0/1.0.

Advancement Budget

All of the presidents who were interviewed indicated a need for adequate budgets to successfully achieve the mission of the advancement team and college or university.

Eighty-five percent (twenty-three) of the presidents annually establish budgets to coordinate with advancement plans, while 7.4 percent (two) perform the function on a weekly or biannual basis.

Table 24

Frequency in which the President Establishes Budgets to Coordinate with Plans for the Institutional Advancement Staff

Frequency	N	Percentage
Weekly	2	7.4
Monthly	0	
Biannually	2	7.4
Annually	23	85.2
Every two or more years	0	
Never	0	
N=27		

The average total college or university budget for institutions with an enrollment under five thousand was $20,341,305, while institutions with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999 had an average budget of $46,829,255. The average college or university budget for institutions with an enrollment from 10,000 to 19,999 students was $168,405,273. Institutions with more than twenty thousand students had a total average budget of $522,501,510.

Table 25

1987-1988 Total College or University Budget by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	10	$20,341,305	9,166,000- 42,000,000
5,000-9,999	5	46,829,255	26,500,000- 82,290,000
10,000-19,999	4	168,405,273	77,000,000- 417,978,000
Over 20,000	6	522,501,510	199,144,000- 938,450,000

College and university public relations budgets for institutions with an enrollment under five thousand students averaged $156,946. Institutions with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999 averaged $402,768 for their public relations operations, while an average of $480,615 was budgeted by schools with an enrollment from 10,000 to 19,999. Institutions with more than twenty thousand students had an average public relations budget of $1,123,101.

Table 26

1987-1988 College or University
Public Relations Budget
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	10	$156,946	51,563- 344,549
5,000-9,999	6	402,768	35,000- 628,610
10,000-19,999	4	480,615	376,140- 586,617
Over 20,000[a]	5	1,123,101	650,000- 1,342,966

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 250,000/1,161,270.

Higher education institutions with an enrollment under five thousand averaged $203,409 for their fund raising budget, with $398,957 averaged by schools with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999. An average of $2,921,788 was budgeted for schools with 10,000 to 19,999 students. Institutions exceeding twenty thousand students averaged $3,011,012.

Table 27

1987-1988 College or University
Fund Raising Budget
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	9	$203,409	36,930-460,777
5,000-9,999	5	398,957	110,000-1,276,000
10,000-19,999	4	2,921,788	304,000-2,872,576
Over 20,000[a]	5	3,011,012	750,000-8,100,000

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 350,000/1,802,155.

Colleges and universities with less than five thousand students averaged $104,314 in their alumni relations budgets. Institutions with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999 averaged $458,000, while schools with 10,000 to 19,999 students averaged $1,636,716. The average alumni relations budget for institutions with more than twenty thousand students was $934,454.

Table 28

1987-1988 College or University
Alumni Relations Budget--Excluding the
Periodical--by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	9	$104,314	31,320- 213,355
5,000-9,999	1	458,000	458,000
10,000-19,999	4	1,636,716	133,000- 550,816
Over 20,000[a]	5	934,454	433,000- 1,500,000

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 250,000/823,637.

Institutions with fewer than five thousand students average $42,711 a year for their alumni periodicals, while $44,200 is averaged by schools with 5,000 to 9,999 students. Colleges and universities with an enrollment from 10,000 to 19,999 average $95,435, for their alumni periodicals. An average of $233,182 is spent by institutions with an enrollment over twenty thousand.

Table 29

1987-1988 College or University
Alumni Periodical Budget
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	9	$42,711	8,000-124,200
5,000-9,999	5	44,200	10,000-100,000
10,000-19,999	4	95,435	52,000-100,000
Over 20,000	5	233,182	78,000-360,000

The average government relations budget for institutions is as follows: $59,000 for institutions with 5,000 to 9,999 students, $121,890 for the school with 10,000 to 19,999 students, and $72,000 for institutions with more than twenty thousand students. None of the colleges and universities with an enrollment less than five thousand had a government relations budget.

Table 30

1987-1988 College or University Government Relations Budget by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	0		
5,000-9,999	2	$59,000	15,000-103,000
10,000-19,999	3	121,890	63,700-201,290
Over 20,000	2	72,000	60,000-85,000

Public Relations

The nine presidents who were interviewed support vigorous public relations activities. Hullar (1988) encourages institutions to evaluate "how we think about ourselves and how we portray ourselves." Cyert (1988) meets on a regular basis with his public relations director at Carnegie-Mellon. They discuss news stories for the university, including potential stories the president believes would have an impact on the institution. "I try to talk about other ways we can advance the institution in terms of our public posture. I try to write op-ed pieces on topics in which I have expertise. The public relations office works to get these into relevant publications."

George Mason University has made a concerted effort to establish a national reputation with Johnson (1988) stating "contrary to what some politicians say--that perception is reality--I say reality is reality. You have to have something real to start with before you can publicize it."

To gain a national reputation, George Mason began by recruiting faculty from the national rank. Johnson (1988) points out:

> We have moved 40 full professors as full professors from other institutions. You shouldn't be able to do that. You shouldn't be able to move people from Harvard to a George Mason. We've done that. We built

> up a small reputation for doing that and were lucky that we got a big front page story in the Wall Street journal several years ago noting that we were doing this. Then a year later came a Nobel Prize for one of our economists. That validated all of the previous stories that could have been dismissed as hype. It made all of them credible and we've been rolling ever since.

From 92.6 to 96.3 percent (twenty-five to twenty-six) of the presidents noted they are very willing to be the featured speaker at various events, meet with individual faculty, and speak to student and faculty groups. From 81.5 to 88.9 percent (twenty-two to twenty-four) of the respondents are very willing to meet with individual students, speak to community groups, speak to parent and staff groups, and meet with news media about non-controversial issues. From 69.2 to 77.8 percent (eighteen to twenty-one) of the respondents are very willing to meet with individuals from the community or staff, meet with individual parents, and meet with news media about controversial issues.

Table 31

President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Public Relations Activities (N/Percentage)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Be the featured speaker at various events	25 92.6	2 7.4	0	0
Meet with news media about non-controversial issues	24 88.9	2 7.4	1 3.7	0
Meet with news media about controversial issues	21 77.8	5 18.5	1 3.7	0
Speak to community groups	23 85.2	4 14.8	0	0
Meet with individuals from the community	18 69.2	7 26.9	1 3.8	0
Speak to faculty groups	26 96.3	1 3.7	0	0
Meet with individual faculty members	25 92.6	2 7.2	0	0

Table 31 (continued)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Speak to staff groups	24 88.9	3 11.1	0	0
Meet with individual staff members	20 74.4	6 22.2	1 3.7	0
Speak to student groups	25 92.6	2 7.4	0	0
Meet with individual students	22 81.5	3 11.1	2 7.4	0
Speak to parent groups	24 88.9	3 11.1	0	0
Meet with individual parents	21 77.8	5 18.5	1 3.7	0

Fund Raising

Fund raising is one of the top priorities for the college and university presidents who were interviewed and will receive greater attention in future years. Like all institutional advancement activities, fund raising is not cyclical but can "rise and fall with meetings and various activities" (Remington, 1988).

Beering (1988) expresses that "I'm not interested in the buck on Wednesday after a speech on Tuesday. I'm interested in the long haul, the next twenty-five to thirty years." Beering's advancement team places a "great emphasis on trust management, estate management, giving people advice from the experts. Team effort!"

Until five or six years ago the University of Iowa did not have any fully endowed chairs. Remington (1988) relates:

> We now have funding at this stage for about thirty, having started a major gift campaign. We hope we will have funding for about sixty endowed chairs. And that's just a seed change for this institution, an institution that had never thought about major endowment funding before.

Cyert (1988) has already allocated fifty days for Carnegie-Mellon's fund raising program in 1988-89, up from twenty-five days.

> "That's going to be a big chunk of time devoted to fund raising. At the same time I don't want to under estimate the fact that I play a very major role internally. I don't just turn over the internal operating to the provost, although I rely on him very heavily and on the deans. So it's a total job and total immersion. You can do more than one thing at one time.

Cyert also has a good knowledge of people in various funding agencies, both private foundations and the federal government. "I know all these people personally and can get on the phone to them. I make certain that I meet with them periodically, usually every year or it might be every other year. We have a regular schedule for that" (Cyert, 1988).

Another dimension of fund raising is the use of volunteers. According to Dunn (1988):

> Sometimes an advancement area will think they must have a lot of staff to be successful. That's just not so. What you can do with volunteers is amazing. That volunteer base is critical because they have made ownership to the institution and have a greater link to the institution. I am opposed to paying students to make calls for alumni phonathons. Our best givers in recent years are those alumni who volunteered to work on the alumni phonathon. They are significant first time givers to the institution. What you do with your volunteers is very important. If they know how much they mean to the institution and what a difference their contact makes, then that ownership relationship grows.

Approximately ninety-two percent (twenty-two) of the respondents are very willing to accept responsibility to call on and close prospects contributing more than $30,000. Seventy-nine percent (nineteen) indicated a willingness to call on prospects contributing from $20,000 to $30,000. Nearly seventy percent (sixteen) of the presidents are willing to take an active role for $15,000 to $20,000.

Table 32

President's Willingness to Accept Responsibility to Call on and Close Prospects Contributing Through Fund Raising Activities (N/Percentage)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Under $5,000	4 17.4	11 47.8	5 21.7	3 13.0
$5,000-10,000	12 52.2	4 17.4	5 21.7	2 8.7
$10,000-15,000	15 62.5	4 16.7	4 16.7	1 4.2
$15,000-20,000	16 69.6	2 8.7	4 17.4	1 4.3
$20,000-30,000	19 79.2	2 8.3	2 8.3	1 4.3
More than $30,000	22 91.7	1 4.2	1 4.2	0

Ninety-three percent (twenty-five) of the chief executives are very willing to become personally involved in hosting luncheon or dinner meetings for top donor prospects or persons contributing more than $10,000. Seventy-four percent (twenty) of the presidents are very willing to assist with the cultivation of foundations and corporations.

Table 33

President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Fund Raising Activities (N/Percentage)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Designate prospects for the development office staff to call on	16 61.5	10 38.5	0	0
Assist with cultivation and solicit support from foundations and corporations	20 74.1	7 25.9	0	0
Host high-level luncheon or dinner meetings for prospective donors	25 92.6	2 7.4	0	0
Host luncheon or dinner meetings for persons contributing more than $10,000	25 92.6	1 3.7	1 3.7	0

With regard to the bottom line in fund raising, schools with an enrollment less than five thousand raised an average of $1,593,882 for their annual fund. The annual fund average for other colleges and universities was $989,696 for institutions with 5,000 to 9,999 students, $2,749,022 for the school with 10,000 to 19,999 students, and $2,722,041 for institutions with more than twenty thousand students.

Table 34

1986-1987 College or University
Annual Funds Raised
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	8	$1,593,882	24,895- 2,000,000
5,000-9,999	5	989,696	50,000- 3,500,000
10,000-19,999	3	2,749,022	300,000- 6,448,024
Over 20,000[a]	4	2,722,041	736,910- 6,328,266

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 700,000/736,910.

Capital campaign contributions averaged $3,247,538 for colleges and universities with fewer than five thousand students and $692,600 for schools with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999. An average of $18,236,378 was raised for the capital campaign by institutions with an enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999. Approximately eighty-five million dollars was raised by the schools with more than twenty thousand students.

Table 35

1986-1987 College or University Capital Campaign Funds Raised by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	4	$3,247,538	164,206-8,419,472
5,000-9,999	4	692,600	16,398-1,454,000
10,000-19,999	2	18,286,378	10,572,755-26,000,000
Over 20,000	1	84,530,101	84,530,101

Approximately $353,000 was the average amount of funds raised through foundation grants by schools with fewer than five thousand students, while $4,349,664 was the average for institutions with 5,000 to 9,999 students. Schools with 10,000 to 19,999 students averaged $9,293,253 and institutions with more than twenty thousand students averaged $3,359,779.

Table 36

1986-1987 College or University Foundation Grants Funds Raised by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	9	$353,178	13,800- 1,500,000
5,000-9,999	3	4,349,664	24,000- 13,000,000
10,000-19,999	2	9,293,253	1,000,000- 17,586,505
Over 20,000[a]	3	3,359,779	1,238,219- 4,941,117

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 1,480,6040/ 2,690,302.

Only larger institutions reported raising funds for individual colleges and schools. Institution with 10,000 to 19,999 students raised an average of $11,276,624, while $21,497,541 was the average for institutions with over twenty thousand students.

Table 37

1986-1987 College or University
Individual Colleges and Schools Funds Raised
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	0		
5,000-9,999	0		
10,000-19,999	2	$11,276,624	2,553,248- 20,000,000
Over 20,000[a]	3	21,497,541	8,498,636- 39,405,041

---

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 1,480,6040/ 14,176,825.

Average funds raised through planned giving efforts are as follows: $806,075 for institutions with an enrollment under five thousand, $396,000 for schools from 5,000 to 9,999, $27,826,101 for institutions with 10,000 to 19,999 students, and $4,992,680 for schools with more than twenty thousand students.

Table 38

1986-1987 College or University Planned Giving Funds Raised by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	5	$806,075	17,364- 3,340,390
5,000-9,999	2	396,000	295,000- 497,000
10,000-19,999	2	27,826,101	16,500,000- 39,152,201
Over 20,000	2	4,992,680	1,989,730- 7,995,630

Alumni Relations

All of the interviewed presidents believe alumni relations is important to the advancement effort and in achieving the institutional mission. Not all of the alumni relations emphasis is toward money. Brewster (1988) points out the following:

> I think alumni who developed a strong educational debt to an institution like to feel that the rest of their lives they can continue to derive some nourishment from the institution from which they graduated. Many of the institutions which do best with alumni do a lot of continuing education programs. Many alumni do not take advantage of those programs, but at least they know they are there and the institution cares enough about their continuing involvement....Our math department, for example, sends out a newsletter to all its graduates in mathematics telling them about recent developments in mathematics and recent developments at the Colleges. We do this to keep up their interest and make them feel that their education as mathematicians is still important and important to the department.

Dunn (1988) believes that presidents and institutions have not utilized their alumni to their potential. Dunn points out:

> Alums are critical to the institution and have an influence and a relationship to the institution in a

> way that others don't. I think presidents don't see alumni as the key to the institution. That's a most unfortunate view. If there's anyone who has ownership it's an alum. I think we serve them short. In my conversations with alums, not just our own, they feel they are not key people to the institution. I don't think you have to be a million dollar giver to be important to a president. It's the relationship that one builds with alums that opens doors, maybe not for your presidency, but for the presidency twenty years from now. Alums play a role in addition to financial support for the institution. They can be very instrumental in helping towards admissions and recruitment. I think presidents should be spending time at alumni board meetings planning how alums could be strategically important to the institution. The result of that is involving alums in admissions in a way that we hadn't previously, involving alums in career planning, and in fund raising--not only soliciting on our behalf but giving. Presidents need to let alums know how important they are.

Purdue University advancement team members annually travel together on the spring break circuit of Florida alumni that covers eleven cities for breakfasts, lunches, and dinners. According to Beering (1988):

The staff all come together so when you have an alumnus who wonders what you are doing in international affairs, federal relations, state relations, it isn't just the president talking. You have the expert right there. I found that when I first started this and we took the whole group some where and spent thirty thousand dollars on a week's trip, somebody might say that was wasted money. Just last Tuesday we did a show together, and it is a show. On Wednesday morning a man called up and said 'I'm really turned on by what you said and I want to send you a little check.' He sent one hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars. We do this three times a year and it has happened every single time. It's not just paid off in checks like that, which for our efforts are considered quite average. We have had people pledging millions of dollars following these trips. They say 'gee, for the first time I really see you have an interest.' For example, one of the things we've done is establish a job placement for alumni. That came out of responses from our western tour that we did with the Glee Club. We had some highly placed alumni in the Seattle area that because of the economic situation with Boeing were out of a job. We couldn't initially help them, but we now have that capability because information is on a computer. People like that become profoundly grateful when you help them find a new job.

Eighty-five percent (twenty-three) of the presidents are very willing to attend important alumni events with 81.5 percent (twenty-two) very willing to write appeals letters for various alumni support. Seventy-eight percent (eighteen) of the presidents are very willing to make an appearance at selected alumni board meetings and make a brief presentation.

Table 39

President's Willingness to Become Personally Involved in Specific Alumni Relations Activities (N/Percentage)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Attend each alumni board meeting and stay the entire time	4 16.0	7 28.0	7 28.0	7 28.0
Make an appearance at each alumni board meeting and make a brief presentation	9 36.0	12 48.0	1 4.0	3 12.0

Table 39 (continued)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
Attend selected alumni board meetings and stay the entire time	17 68.0	5 20.0	2 8.0	1 4.0
Make an appearance at selected alumni board meetings and make a brief presentation	18 78.3	5 21.7	0	0
Attend all alumni events	4 16.0	5 20.0	3 12.0	13 52.0
Attend the majority of alumni events	6 26.1	6 26.1	6 26.1	5 21.7
Attend important alumni events	23 85.2	3 11.1	1 3.7	0
Write appeals letters for various alumni support	22 81.5	3 11.1	1 3.7	1 3.7
Write a column for the alumni publication	17 68.0	7 28.0	1 4.0	0

Colleges and universities with under five thousand students averaged $1,351,969 through alumni giving, while $2,793,568 was averaged by institutions with an enrollment of 5,000 to 9,999. The institution with an enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999 reported $4,013,857 in alumni giving funds. An average of $7,804,520 was averaged by schools with an enrollment over twenty thousand.

Table 40

1986-1987 College or University
Alumni Giving Funds Raised
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	7	$1,351,969	13,070- 7,077,394
5,000-9,999	3	2,793,568	15,000- 8,350,000
10,000-19,999	1	4,013,857	4,013,857
Over 20,000[a]	3	7,804,520	1,383,238- 15,404,496

[a] The figure for one institution has been excluded since the university involved uses a central organizational structure for all institutions in the system. Other institutions in the study have independent organizational units. Inclusion of the figure/median is 2,332,959/ 6,625,825.

Institutions believe it is important to communicate with alumni and generally use an alumni periodical to inform former students about campus achievements, alumni activities, and individual alumni accomplishments.

The average number of alumni on a college or university periodical mailing list is 17,928 for schools with an enrollment under five thousand, 28,428 for institutions with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999, and 49,275 for schools with 10,000 to 19,999 students. Institutions with more than twenty thousand students have an average of 50,500 alumni on their periodical mailing list.

Table 41

1987-1988 College or University
Alumni on the Periodical Mailing List
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	10	17,928	6,000-50,000
5,000-9,999	5	28,428	7,500-48,000
10,000-19,999	4	49,275	28,000-65,600
Over 20,000	5	50,500	25,000-103,000

Periodical publishing times for institutions with less than five thousand students is five times a year, while institutions with an enrollment of 5,000 to 9,999 publish approximately four times a year. Colleges and universities with an enrollment of 10,000 to 19,999 publish an alumni periodical 4.3 times a year with an average of seven periodicals being published by schools with more than twenty thousand students.

Table 42

1987-1988 College or University
Periodical Publishing Times a Year
by Enrollment

Enrollment	N	Mean	Range
Under 5,000	10	5.0	3-9
5,000-9,999	6	4.0	3-4
10,000-19,999	4	4.3	4-5
Over 20,000	5	7.0	4-11

Government Relations

When constituencies ask George Mason's President Johnson why he spends so much time thinking about or being at the state capitol, it reminds him of what Willie Sutton said when asked why he robbed banks. "Because that's where the money is" (Johnson, 1988). At the beginning of his presidency Johnson reasoned:

> The key to what we had to have lay in the state treasury. So every possible aspect of the university, I insisted, had to be passed under the political glass. If the student newspaper wrote a story, I couldn't control what they wrote but we had to be sensitive to what this meant to us in Richmond. Anything that happened, we asked what is this going to do to us in Richmond. Anything we were going to make happen we asked the same question. I frankly discouraged people from looking at the potential wealth in relationship with Washington D.C. organizations and institutions. I simply thought I had to do that so they wouldn't be distracted. Our compass had to be set toward Richmond.

Abegg (1988) asserts that it is very important for private and state institutions to be involved in government relations. He relates:

> With the funding we currently need from the federal and state levels, it's important to maintain good relationships with the legislators in both of those areas to protect what we have and where appropriate to pursue funds. In Illinois we have one of the finest state funded scholarship programs that provides awards to financially needy students which permits a

> significant number, about sixty percent, to enroll in independent institutions. We have to watch to be sure that the program is maintained, as well as increased when conditions warrant. More important is that we don't have incursions into the program from others that may harm the monetary quantity. With limited resources we have to see that we retain what we currently have.

When the legislature is in session, college and university government relations activities go on steadily. Remington (1988) states that "It's a relatively rare week when I'm not in Des Moines having dinner with legislators or otherwise lending a hand in the legislative process."

In Iowa the presidents of the three major public institutions have a weekly conference call to compare legislative notes. The call includes the presidents, the president of the Board of Regents, the executive secretary of the board, as well as each institution's lobbyists. "This keeps us on top of each piece of legislation that is introduced and enables us to make in-course corrections to our legislative strategy which is developed in a series of meetings before the legislative session gets underway."

The Iowa presidents prioritize their legislative requests for the regents. "...It's incumbent on all of us to work together and push for that overall budget to be funded" (Remington, 1988).

When Beering (1988) assumed the Purdue presidency in 1983 he believed there were two natural partners among the higher education institutions in Indiana--Purdue and Indiana University. He felt that the two institutions needed to work together to compliment one another's programatic efforts because they shared campuses in the two largest cities in the state--Indianapolis and Fort Wayne. Beering noted:

> It makes absolutely no sense for these two huge institutions...to be in any way whatsoever adversarial and confrontational. We have to work together. We conceptualized and I conceptualized the notion that...we ought to go jointly forward and search out what the priorities are to be and agree upon them. It's easy to come forward in a given year and ask for forty million dollars for a project at Indiana University and for forty million dollars for a project at Purdue which may in fact be in competition because of the size of the dollar value. So what the IU president and I have done each of these last number of years is to say let's look at what you need, let's look at what we need and come forward with a request that is consummate, complimentary and sequenced. So if we have a major project that needs doing, let's decide what needs doing more in terms of the actual needs. Then we'll support each other's project and we won't

> compete. We'll sequence it and tell the legislature that we have these two big projects. We tell the legislature that we are asking for the IU project this year and the Purdue project next year. And we're not going to fight with you about who you are going to give the money to. The result of that kind of thing has been a remarkable cooperation and support from alumni, community leaders, and legislators for five years running now. I would recommend that cooperation for institutions in other states, but the problem is there are so many deeply entrenched rivalries, mostly around sports. We still have annual IU-Purdue football and basketball games that are very spirited contests, bitter rivalries going back one hundred and fifty years. We don't want to change that. But there's no reason whatever not to share library holdings, computer resources, campus physical resources, and all manner of cooperation on the academic scene.

Cyert (1988) meets with the Pennsylvania congressional delegation at least once a year, in addition to traveling to Washington D.C. several times a year to meet with various congressional representatives. When the university has special issues, Cyert does not hesitate to get on the phone with legislators.

According to Dunn (1988), presidents of public and private institutions must educate their governor as to the importance of education to the state. Dunn states:

> If we really care about our states and where education is going in this country, we've got to put aside some of our own personal biases and look at education as a whole and see how we all fit into that whole. More and more the twenty-first century is going to be marked with demand for leadership in education at all levels and linkages with those educational endeavors at all levels--elementary, secondary, post-secondary education. Presidents do need to work with governors to educate them as to how important education is in his or her respective state. And then we educate them on the importance of the people they put on boards. We need people who have a vision and a sense of stewardship....We must rise above our protection of turf and be leaders in the whole realm of education. We need to ask how can we as leaders in the educational community work together to make sure we do not duplicate, that we are appreciate of the money we receive, and that we provide a continuous quality of educational excellence.

More than 96 percent (twenty-six) of the presidents specify they are very willing to meet with the governor, while 92.6 percent (twenty-five) presidents are very willing to meet with other executive branch members of government. From 85.2 to 88.9 percent (twenty-three to twenty-four) are very willing to meet with state legislators and congressional representatives. Only 66.7 percent (eighteen) of the respondents noted they are very willing to meet with educational lobbyists.

Table 43

President's Willingness to Meet with Specific Government Relations Individuals (N/Percentage)

Variable	Very	Somewhat	Hesitant	Unwilling
The governor	26 96.3	1 3.7	0	0
Other executive branch members	25 92.6	2 7.4	0	0
State legislators	24 88.9	3 11.1	0	0
Congressional representatives	23 85.2	4 14.8	0	0
Educational lobbyists	18 66.7	6 22.2	3 11.1	0

The Future of Institutional Advancement

Institutional advancement "...absolutely has to have" a priority on a president's agenda in the future (Remington, 1988). Remington points out that:

> There are so many advancement functions that cannot be delegated. On the other hand, if you are fortunate to have an outstanding staff in each one of the advancement areas, then there are a lot of things you don't have to say or do. But you have to be available when those good people suggest that they need you to lend a hand. When you are talking about the institutional fabric of the university, then that's something the president ought to be comfortable with and able to discuss. I think institutional advancement for public universities in the years just ahead is going to be more critical. As state-aided institutions, we need to think of a funding base and a set of rules that brings us closer to our counterparts in private universities. That trend started a few years ago and seems to be accelerating.

Dunn (1988) asserts the following:

> I think the future for institutional advancement in institutions throughout the United States is going to be the critical backbone of the institution. With less and less government money, the responsibility and burden is going to be on the president in institutional

advancement areas to ensure that the support is there for the institution. Advancement is going to play a considerably more important role in the future. At that point presidents have got to be people who can work effectively in that area. Leadership is critical!

Summary

This chapter included descriptive research and statistical results collected through presidential interviews and two survey instruments on the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement. Comments by presidents and precede survey data.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, ADVANCEMENT MODEL, RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into the following sections: Summary, Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership, Recommendations, and Suggestions for Further Study.

Summary

Presidential procrastination in institutional advancement victimizes the potential of the college or university, stranding the president and institution on a road to mediocrity or failure.

Institutional advancement refers to public relations, fund raising, alumni relations and government relations programs and activities practiced by professionals in colleges and universities. The primary function of institutional advancement is the cultivation of constituency esteem and sustenance that culminates in institutional needs--human resources and financial assets.

Henry Dunster became the first president to champion leadership in advancement when he took an active part in writing a public relations pamphlet for Harvard University in 1641. Dunster also headed institutional advancement efforts with regard to soliciting funds, working with alumni, and establishing close relations with government officials (Morison, 1935). Dunster recognized, as presidents do today, that advancement activities on the part of the president are essential to position an institution and enhance the public's confidence in higher education.

A fundamental issue higher education must address is the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement. Do presidents believe they are merely props to embellish a fund raising or public relations campaign? Are presidents willing to personally commit to advancement efforts or do they see themselves as sideshow barkers hyping attractions, looking for the fast buck?

Twenty-eight presidents participated in a national study that included interviews with nine presidents and the completion of a survey instrument by twenty-seven CEO's. Public relations directors completed a demographic questionnaire. A total of forty-six presidents from public, private independent, and private religious institutions were surveyed.

Judgement and stratified random samples were taken from the population of member institutions in the Council for

Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) as listed in the 1987 membership directory. The judgement sample consisted of 23 members that were awarded medals by CASE in two categories of annual competition from 1985 to 1987. Categories for the judgement sample include General Program Excellence, and the President and the Public. Institutions in the judgement sample were compared to randomly selected and stratified member institutions.

Approximately 61 percent of the sample responded, while approximately 24 percent of the presidents requested not to participate in the study due to other commitments. The remaining presidents did not respond to initial or follow-up contacts.

Presidential Leadership

Presidents participating in the study unanimously agreed that their role in public relations and the overall institutional advancement program must be high for the institution to be successful with constituencies. The majority of the presidents also indicated a high degree of importance for their role in fund raising (85 percent), alumni relations (78 percent), and government relations (63 percent) in order for their institution to be successful with constituencies.

Richard D. Remington (1988), president of the University of Iowa, notes that institutional advancement "...absolutely has to have" a priority on a president's agenda. President Catherine Dunn (1988) of Clarke College adds that advancement is "the critical backbone of the institution" and that the president has the responsibility "to ensure that the support is there for the institution. Leadership is critical!"

Steven C. Beering (1988), president of Purdue University, points out that leadership in institutional advancement cannot be delegated to other campus officers. "The president must believe advancement is important and must get out front and show by his own personal commitment and presence that he wants everybody else to be on the team."

The reason advancement is primarily a presidential duty according to Theodore L. Hullar (1988), chancellor of the University of California-Davis, is because people want to feel the president is leading the way. Constituencies personally want to see the chief executive officer and hear commitment in the tone of the president's voice.

Advancement leadership is an enterprise of institutional resolution. Presidents must practice and advocate proactive leadership in the advancement areas in order to realize the institutional mission.

Elements crucial to success with constituencies are presidential vision, participation, and team effort. In placing the best foot forward for the institution, presidents believe they must be a role model who is up front, setting the pace, acting on convictions that are honest and ethical. Beering (1988) emphasizes that constituencies will support colleges and universities if presidents would communicate the message "...repeatedly, constantly, forcefully, and articulately" that the institution has a direction and that the focal point of that direction is the constituency itself. "It's a team effort."

Hullar (1988) suggests that results in advancement are "...dependent on trust and respect that occurs on a one-on-one basis, person-to-person basis," while Richard M. Cyert (1988), president of Carnegie-Mellon University, adds that presidents "should get to know the relevant players..."

A president is the only campus individual that has a panoramic view of the issues confronting institutional advancement and influencing higher education. Those issues include funding from government and private sources, addressing societal problems such as literacy and racism, meeting demands for skilled workers and economic development, and providing public services that benefit our communities, states, and country. Cyert (1988) states "the president...looks at the institution in totality whereas others tend to look at the institution in terms of parts. There's is no dimension of the university that the president should not be aware of and take into account."

The fate of presidents who do not immerse themselves or their institutions in advancement activities will be diminished public support; inadequate funding; fewer students; and a lack of commitment by faculty, staff, alumni, and trustees. Beering (1988) notes that if the president sets high expectations and demonstrates through personal involvement that advancement is important to the college or university, then people will become involved. "It's contagious. People catch on and they participate."

Advancement Strategy

From 85 to 89 percent of the presidents rate their current involvement as high in public relations and the overall institutional advancement program, while 59 to 63 percent of the presidents consider their present involvement high in government relations and fund raising. Only 31 percent of the presidents note they have a high involvement in alumni relations with 62 percent rating their alumni involvement as moderate.

Eighty-five percent of the presidents desire a high degree of involvement in the overall advancement program, while approximately 74 percent desire a high degree of involvement in public relations and fund raising. Sixty-five percent of the presidents want a high degree of involvement in government relations. Approximately 46 percent of the presidents desire only moderate involvement in alumni relations with 42 percent of the CEO's wanting high alumni involvement.

A high degree of success is expected by presidents in public relations (89 percent), the overall institutional advancement program (85 percent), fund raising (74 percent), and alumni relations (63 percent). Only 59 percent of the presidents surveyed expect a high degree of success in government relations.

Overall, presidents do play and desire a vital role in institutional advancement. In order for the institution and president to be successful with constituencies, CEO's must be proactive in their long-range strategy. Presidents employing a proactive strategy circle their wagons to encompass constituencies, while CEO's using a reactive strategy circle their wagons to exclude constituencies.

A proactive style of leadership permits the president to address anticipated challenges in a positive manner, in addition to providing a solid base of experience for problems that cannot be anticipated and require a reactive strategy in crisis or sensitive situations. Reactive strategy that is defacto policy, rather than the exception, will be viewed by constituencies as ineffective and unable to realize the potential of the institution. Trustees, with the authority to dismiss or retain a president's services, will no doubt draw the same conclusions. The president must avoid battling fires in order to have time to plant the seeds for institutional growth.

Presidents who are laissez-faire in their strategy have little or no power with constituencies and simply obstruct, restrict, and deter success in institutional advancement.

George W. Johnson (1988), president of George Mason University, asserts that strategy is critical in order "...to own the hearts and minds of constituencies. We have to be the object of pride."

A dynamic advancement strategy eliminates constituency credibility gaps. Beering believes that "once you have constituencies in the fold and they read your publications and they come to your meetings, then you have an audience to whom you can give your message. Until you can do that you're talking to yourself."

Hullar, Johnson, and Remington (1988) advocate that presidents should keep a high profile and integrate their advancement program with the college or university mission.

Planning

Planning follows the conceptualization of an advancement strategy and has a prominent place on presidential agendas. Presidents responding to the survey specified their commitment to planning by establishing, reviewing, and involving others in advancement activities.

Seventy to 78 percent of the college and university presidents participating in the study indicate a high degree of their public relations, fund raising, and government relations goals and objectives are clearly defined and based on the institutional mission. Sixty-seven percent of the overall program goals are based on the institutional mission, while 59 percent of the alumni relations goals and objectives are based on the institutional mission.

A majority (56 percent) of presidents annually establish long-range goals and 81 percent of the CEO's review those goals annually or biannually. Short-range goals and objectives are established and reviewed monthly or weekly by 82 to 86 percent of the presidents. Presidents track progress monthly (56 percent) and weekly (33 percent).

Presidents involve other offices in advancement activities with the institutional advancement staff on a weekly or monthly basis 67 percent of the time, while communicating advancement plans to faculty and staff takes place biannually 44 percent of the time, annually 22 percent of the time, weekly 19 percent of the time, and monthly 15 percent of the time. Nearly 41 percent of the presidents indicate they offer advancement services to faculty and staff on a weekly basis, while 45 percent offer services on an annual or biannual basis. Presidents generally encourage faculty and staff participation in advancement activities on an annual (29 percent), biannual (29 percent), or monthly (25 percent) basis.

President Carroll W. Brewster (1988) of Hobart and William Smith Colleges stresses that the president should chair the planning committee since the goals and objectives that evolve will ultimately form the document to which the president is committed.

Planning should be focused on campus-wide program endeavors, not money. "It ought to be a two-way street where you get input from your constituencies in terms of your programatic modifications that will keep the institution at the cutting edge" (Beering, 1988).

Initially plans should be established by each of the institutional advancement areas with the president reviewing and refining goals and objectives with advancement leaders and top administrative officers. Cyert's (1988) advancement staff thinks in terms of proactive strategy to achieve long-range and and short-range goals and objectives. He reviews the total strategy of the advancement team and meets regularly with individual directors.

As to achieving advancement goals and objectives, James B. Holderman (1988), president of the University of South Carolina-Columbia, states "I expect people will hold my feet to the fire if we don't achieve our objectives and be helpful and laudatory if we do."

Staffing

A competent staff is the backbone of the institutional advancement effort. The average professional and support staff size for institutions with less than five thousand students is 13 individuals, while schools with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999 average 35 team members. Colleges and universities with 10,000 to 19,999 students average 66 staffers with an average of 119 professional and support staff employed in institutions with more than twenty thousand students. The majority of staff members come from the areas of public relations and fund raising. Institutions with less than five thousand students do not have government relations personnel.

Advancement staff members who demonstrate initiative are unanimously prized by presidents, with 89 to 96 percent of the CEO's placing a high value on professional competence, responsibility, creativity, interpersonal skills, and effectiveness in dealing with constituencies. Seventy percent of the presidents feel support from faculty is only a somewhat important characteristic for an advancement staff member to possess. Generally (85 percent), presidents rely on personal conversations with staff to keep updated about advancement activities.

Hullar (1988) notes "if you don't have quality staff, you don't advance. I think it dooms your enterprise to poor or less than adequate results."

Staff members must share the vision of the president for the advancement effort to be successful and presidents must see to it that advancement colleagues "are all reading from the same hymn sheet and making understandable noises together" (Beering, 1988). Beering points out if you set high expectations you achieve high results.

Advancement Budget

Institutional advancement budgets vary considerably for colleges and universities and underline the commitment an institution has for its proactive advancement efforts. Those budgets include salaries and funds for operating, travel, and professional services/consultants.

Eighty-five percent of the presidents annually establish budgets to coordinate with advancement plans.

From the institutions participating in the study, public relations budgets averaged approximately $156,946 for institutions with an enrollment under five thousand students, $402,768 for schools with 5,000 to 9,999 students, $480,615 for institutions with 10,000 to 19,999 students, and $1,123,101 for schools with over twenty thousand students.

Higher education institutions with an enrollment under five thousand averaged nearly $203,409 for their fund raising budget, with $398,957 for schools with an enrollment from 5,000 to 9,999. An average of $2,921,788 was budgeted for schools with 10,000 to 19,000 students. Institutions exceeding twenty thousand students averaged about three million dollars.

Alumni relations budgets, excluding periodicals, averaged approximately $104,314 for colleges and universities with less than five thousand students, $458,000 for schools with 5,000 to 9,999 students, $1,636,716 for institutions with 10,000 to 19,000 students, and $934,454 for schools with over twenty thousand students.

The average government relations budget for institutions is as follows: $59,000 for institutions with 5,000 to 9,999 students, $121,890 for responding schools with 10,000 to 19,000 students, and $72,000 for institutions with more than twenty thousand students. None of the colleges and universities with an enrollment less than five thousand had a government relations budget.

Brewster (1988) notes that implementation of advancement plans will "...involve a reallocation of how we spend our own money." Brewster first establishes budgets based on institutional plans through an internal consensus. He next involves trustees so "...they become involved with the plan and are completely committed to it. Without their commitment, we can't carry it out."

Public Relations

A majority of the presidents like to take advantage of participating in public relations activities. From 93 to 96 percent of the CEO's are very willing to be the featured speaker at various events; meet with individual faculty; and speak to faculty and student groups. From 82 to 89 percent of the presidents are very willing to meet with news media about non-controversial issues, to speak to community, parent, or staff groups, and meet with individual students.

Presidents vigorously support proactive public relations activities with Cyert (1988) frequently sitting down with his public relations director to discuss different ways they "...can advance the institution in terms of our public posture."

Johnson (1988) is quick to point out that "contrary to what some politicians say--that perception is reality--I say reality is reality. You have to have something real to start with before you can publicize it." Institutions promoting programs that do not have substance have their news stories dismissed as hype by the media. That destroys credibility of the public relations staff, persons involved in the program, and the college or university. Public relations programs that are continually operating on a reactive basis also create constituency doubt about a president's ability to lead and the professional staff's competency to conduct advancement programs.

Beering (1988) relates:

> I literally spend every evening and every weekend related to alumni, to the community, to advancement efforts....One of the reasons that some CEO's of

universities shy away from this is that it means you are really doing an extra job and your free time is gone.

Fund Raising

Fund raising is currently a top priority for college and university presidents and is expected to receive greater attention in future years. When fund raising is receiving attention, 92 percent of the presidents are very willing to accept responsibility to call on and close prospects contributing more than ten thousand dollars. Presidents are less interested as the dollar amount drops.

Ninety-three percent of the chief executives are very willing to become personally involved in hosting luncheon or dinner meetings for top donor prospects or persons contributing more than $10,000. Seventy-four percent of the presidents are very willing to assist with the cultivation of foundations and corporations.

With regard to the bottom line in fund raising, colleges and universities have placed a considerable effort on obtaining funds from individuals and corporations. That emphasis has resulted in approximately $25,000 to $85,000,000 being raised through the annual fund, capital campaign, foundation grants, planned giving, and other fund raising efforts during 1986 and 1987. It goes without saying that those figures indicate the money is out there for worthy causes. But as more public institutions become interested and sophisticated in their fund raising efforts, the competition will be stiffer between colleges and universities throughout the nation. For those reasons, it is necessary for presidents to have a proactive strategy for fund raising. Chief executive officers who are reactive in their fund raising approach will find they are not competitive in cultivating and securing funds from outside sources.

Dunn believes that volunteer support can make a big difference in fund raising efforts since volunteers develop a strong tie to the institution. Dunn (1988) notes "If they know how much they mean to the institution and what a difference their contact makes, then that ownership relationship grows."

Remington (1988) contends fund raising is more or less a continuous process depending on the time of year and various campus activities. Cyert (1988) has already allocated fifty days for fund raising at Carnegie-Mellon in 1988-89, an increase of twenty-five days.

Alumni Relations

Presidents who were interviewed agree that alumni relations plays an important part in the institutional advancement effort, but as previously noted, alumni relations is only receiving moderate attention by 61 percent of the CEO's responding to the survey instrument. Of the study respondents, 78 to 85 percent of the presidents are very willing to attend important alumni events, write appeals letters for various alumni support, and make a brief presentation at selected alumni meetings. More than half of the presidents are unwilling to attend all alumni events, but 68 percent of the presidents very willing to attend selected alumni board meetings and stay the entire time.

The chief form of communication with alumni is through periodicals mailed four to seven times a year. Those publications reach an approximate average of 18,000 to 50,500 alumni per mailing.

The laissez-faire leadership style toward alumni could be a reason why 59 percent of the presidents consider alumni relations a weak program. Have some presidents forgotten the importance of alumni to their institutions?

Colleges and universities organized alumni associations so that "...alumni could perpetuate the qualities and strengthen the weaknesses of an institution and, in so doing, add value to a degree earned at that institution" Ransdell (1986, p. 374). Dunn (1988) points out that presidents have not utilized their alumni to their potential. Dunn encourages presidents to tell alumni how important they are to the institution and not to solely view former students as donors.

Brewster (1988) contends alumni "...who developed a strong educational debt to an institution like to feel that the rest of their lives they can continue to derive some nourishment from the institution from which they graduated."

Some presidents have not always viewed alumni as key people to a college or university, but success in the overall institutional advancement program will require a change in attitude by those presidents not investing in their alumni (Dunn, 1988).

It is imperative that presidents utilize a proactive strategy with alumni. Sooner or later presidents with a laissez-faire attitude toward alumni will awaken to find they must react to alumni desires and demands. Alumni will become distrustful of the CEO who does not develop proactive alumni programs and only turns to alumni when the institution wants money or other types of assistance.

Purdue University does take alumni seriously with advancement team members traveling throughout the United States to demonstrate to alumni the university has an investment in them. Beering (1988) uses his advancement experts in career planning, state and federal relations, estate planning, and other areas to get the message across.

The Purdue job placement program for alumni came out of a need by Seattle alumni who:

> ...because of the economic situation with Boeing were out of a job. We couldn't initially help them, but we now have that capability....People like that become profoundly grateful when you help them find a new job.

They say 'gee, for the first time I really see you have an interest'" (Beering, 1988).

Government Relations

A significant majority (85 to 96 percent) of college and university presidents are very willing to meet with governors, state executive branch members and legislators, and congressional representatives. That proactive attitude, translated into action, will result in closer ties with government officials and a better understanding of the needs for higher education.

When constituencies ask George Mason's President Johnson why he spends so much time thinking about or being at the state capitol, it reminds him of what Willie Sutton said when asked why he robbed banks. "Because that's where the money is" (Johnson, 1988).

At the federal level, Cyert (1988) meets annually with congressional representatives and has a good knowledge of people in funding agencies. When special issues arise, he personally calls his government contacts.

The key to much of an institution's financial support, particularly public schools, lays in state and federal treasuries. President Martin G. Abegg (1988) of Bradley University admonishes presidents to watch treasuries to ensure programs can be maintained and increased when warranted.

Government relations has a high priority for private and public university presidents alike. The flow of funds has dwindled over the years and presidents believe their personal participation is essential to the welfare of their institution and higher education. Institutions must now look to each other for support, develop a proactive strategy, and push aside the adversarial grab bag for government money. Beering points out that Purdue and Indiana University cooperate in their legislative budget requests by sequencing expensive projects. That effort "...has been a remarkable cooperation and support from alumni, community leaders, and legislators..." (Beering, 1988).

Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership

An institutional advancement model for presidential leadership evolved following a thorough examination of presidential interviews, survey instruments, and the review of the literature.

In striving to reach higher education's pinnacle, it is imperative that the president is proactive, accepting challenges and finding solutions to strategically position the institution to meet the college or university mission. Institutional advancement is a critical and highly visible agent in realizing the college or university mission.

Advancement activities are designed to demonstrate that the institution is worthy of constituency support that results in the enrichment of innovative programs, quality teaching, noteworthy research, and effective public service.

Through collaboration with the advancement staff, the proactive president can create bold ideas and innovative directions to attain institutional goals and objectives. The practice is neither simple nor can it be taken lightly. Constituency support encompasses attention to needs, straightforward communications, realistic requests, sound justifications, and substantial leadership. The president must have enthusiasm, strength, vitality, and vision to inspire the advancement staff and constituencies.

The Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership is three-dimensional and may be compared to a Rubik's Cube puzzle. The cube has six colored sides which symbolize the following advancement components: public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, government relations, institutional personnel, and constituencies. Each side consists of nine interconnecting subcubes that can be rotated to an endless number of combinations. The fifty-four subcubes symbolize intervening and causal variables that represent the present condition of the institution and influence institutional consequences. Those factors include budget, individual and organizational needs, motivators, leadership styles, short and long-range goals, objectives, expectations, skill levels, etc. No matter what combination of components and variables exist, the hexagon maintains its basic form and symbolizes the mission of the institution.

The advancement hexagon ultimately rests in the hands of the president, although other college or university leaders have a degree of responsibility, particularly the advancement vice president. In contrast to correctly matching the colored sides of the Rubik's Cube, the advancement hexagon must be positioned in proactive ways that combine advancement components and variables to meet the institutional mission. All of the components and variables are dependent upon one another to maintain the shape of the hexagon--the institutional mission. However, the advancement hexagon must be continually adjusted and evaluated since no one combination is proper for all institutions. Nor can one combination for an institution continue to work indefinitely.

Proactive positioning of the advancement model provides a president with positive opportunities to respond to anticipated challenges through a strategy characterized by reflection, refinement, implementation, and evaluation. Advancement positioning that is proactive makes a significant and positive institutional impact.

Recommendations

Recommendations for presidents to ensure a successful institutional advancement program include the following:

1. Establish robust and proactive leadership in institutional advancement as a priority.

Proactive and vigorous leadership is required to properly position the college or university; to realize the institutional mission; and to facilitate awareness, appreciation, and support by constituencies. Presidents should learn all they can about the importance and primary functions of advancement without trying to be a technician.

2. Lead with enthusiasm, strength, vitality, honest and ethical convictions, a vision to inspire others, and teamwork.

The president must be the role model who articulately and frequently communicates the contributions and needs of the institution to constituencies. Ultimate responsibility for realizing the institutional mission belongs to the president and rests to a considerable degree on the president's ability to ensure success in institutional advancement. Presidents cannot merely advocate the virtues of institutional advancement in a philosophical manner, but must lead. The president who relinquishes advancement responsibility, abdicates the presidency.

3. Formulate an advancement strategy that reflects where the institution has been, where it is now, and where it wants to go.

Proper advancement strategy can be decisive for a president and institution in realizing the college or university mission. This mirrors proactive leadership.

College and university images are based on the composite impression, knowledge, beliefs, experiences, and enthusiasm constituencies have about the institution. A strong and positive institutional image influences constituencies to support a college or university, to speak favorably of it, and to believe in its mission and goals. Constituency support increases with positive interactions. The public depends on higher education to be trustworthy. The future of higher education depends on public confidence.

A president's vision, coupled with a willingness and capacity for leadership, are characteristics that will lead to institutional success.

4. Chair the planning committee and involve advancement staff members.

The president should chair the planning committee for institutional advancement since it is the president who holds the responsibility for planning success. Advancement staff members should be involved at all stages, particularly during initial stages. If the president desires the staff to work as a team, the plan has to be a team effort.

Presidents should encourage staff members to think strategically (proactive) at all times, not just for their particular advancement area, but in terms of the total advancement strategy.

5. Clearly define and base advancement goals and objectives on the institutional mission.

Goals and objectives should be clearly defined and based on the institutional mission. High but realistic expectations will demonstrate to constituencies and personnel that the president is committed to institutional advancement.

CEO's should annually or biannually establish and review long-range goals and objectives with an executive advancement officer/vice president and directors. Short-range goals and objectives should be established and reviewed monthly.

As often as possible presidents should encourage and involve faculty and other campus staff in advancement activities. Communicate advancement plans to those constituencies frequently. The college or university is an investment for internal and external constituencies alike.

6. Abstain from personal involvement in time intensive projects or activities.

Due to an overall monumental workload, presidents should weigh the priority and time required to participate in activities or projects. Use advancement staff members to handle the bulk of the load before presidential action is required. Events and meetings should be scheduled that maximize advancement efforts through presidential participation. Presidents can make the best use of their time by making appearances at a greater number of advancement activities, rather than staying for the duration of only a few activities. The net result will be a positive impact on the advancement program.

7. Hire and retain the best professionals in the field.

Outside of the president, the key to making the advancement program a success is a competent professional staff. Presidents should hire and retain the best people they can find. Important characteristics in advancement staff members are initiative, creativity, interpersonal skills, responsibility, and effectiveness in dealing with constituencies. It is critical that the chief executive officer employ a loyal, interdependent team of proactive players since it is the team effort that will lead the institution to success.

Presidents should ensure that staff members fully comprehend the advancement strategy and are given the opportunity to grow personally and professionally through the campus environment and attendance at conferences and workshops. The advancement profession is characterized by sharing ideas that will enhance the effectiveness of individual staff members, the institution, and higher education in general.

8. Delegate the responsibility and coordination of advancement functions to an executive officer.

A vice president or other executive officer experienced in one or more disciplines of institutional advancement is recommended to facilitate the coordination of advancement functions. The vice president should be a flexible and capable professional who can serve as a close advisor to the president. This individual must share the advancement vision of the president, have a broad outlook for the primary advancement functions, and have the ability to effectively bring together professionals from each of the disciplines to achieve the advancement and institutional missions.

Careful selection of an executive administrator to head the advancement division is imperative. The area is too critical to the president and institution to leave to persons not immersed in and dedicated to the profession. Unfortunately some CEO's continue the practice of hiring individuals not suited for advancement. That practice occurs due to misconceptions some people hold about public relations and have transferred to other advancement disciplines. Those misconceptions include the notion that anyone can do the job, advancement is for those who like to socialize and meet people, and that practitioners need little training. Institutional advancement is one of few fields where transference of skills is commonly accepted by some presidents--a geologist or accountant becomes an advancement officer.

Institutional advancement vice presidents must have equal status with other executive officers. No longer can institutions afford to have one or two vice presidents steering the wagon while the others tag along for the ride. Institutional advancement must be considered equal in importance with academics. We have reached a point in higher education where it is difficult to perceive which comes first in attaining the college or university mission--students and faculty or institutional support. One will not subsist minus the other.

9. Provide advancement budgets to achieve goals, objectives, and the institutional mission.

Adequate budgets are essential for advancement success and should be carefully drafted during proactive planning sessions. Presidents should ensure that budgets are capable of supporting and retaining quality professional staff, are adequate to achieve goals and objectives, and are reasonable for the return of investment in the advancement strategy. Attention should be given to how the institution spends its money across the board. Reallocations might be justified to parallel the institution's commitment to advancement and the college or university mission.

10. Insist that public relations activities and programs are based on substance and integrity.

Substance and integrity must be the cornerstones of all public relations programs and activities. With today's sophistication of communication mediums and messages, constituencies easily distinguish between what is tangible and what is hype. Once the institution compromises integrity with constituencies, it no longer has an audience which is receptive to the institutional message. Proactive leadership is the key to success in public relations, although situations will arise that require a reactive posture.

Presidents should be out front, relating honestly and ethically with all constituencies. Everyone wants access to the president because the president is the one individual who can speak with absolute authority as to the institution's direction. Presidents should be as accessible as priorities permit, remembering that the college or university mission will only be realized with the help of constituencies.

11. Generate a feeling in donors that they have a special institutional ownership.

Raising funds has become a leading duty for presidents in helping to support institutional programs. No matter what needs a campus has, fund raising efforts should be based on the institutional mission. As competition for funds increases, donors will take a greater interest in their contributions. Presidents should strive to make prospective and current donors feel they have a unique ownership in the institution. Donors should be made to feel that their tangible leadership is an appreciating investment in the college or university, the community, the state, country, and higher education.

Fund raising requires vigorous presidential support, involvement, and leadership. It is the proactive president who inspires the motivation and confidence for large contributions.

12. Ensure and reiterate to alumni that they are part of the institution's present and future.

The one area of institutional advancement that needs immediate and continual proactive attention is alumni relations. Presidents must work to ensure alumni truly have a home where their hearts are--not just a place to pass the hat. Alumni have a steadfast commitment to the institution and want to be a part of its present and future, not its past. That loyalty can be translated into volunteer leadership in all areas of the college or university--admissions, donor cultivation, job placement, etc.

Presidents must encourage alumni to take part in a variety of institutional activities and show appreciation for alumni efforts. Other constituencies an institution is trying to influence will recognize that the college or university takes care of it own.

13. Establish closer contacts with government leaders at all levels.

Government relations must continue to have a high priority for college and university presidents. With public treasuries shrinking, CEO's must work harder than ever to demonstrate to government officials that their proactive institutions are deserving of support and contributing to society in vital ways.

Presidents should establish closer contacts with government leaders; provide relevant, factual, and timely information; and work to ensure government officials feel a part of the higher education team. More cooperation between presidents in each state is required to develop effective strategies in working with government leaders. Requests for funds must be based on the institutional mission since accountability will be the scale on which government officials base future allocations.

14. Be open to communication and change.

Presidents must be open to communication, accepting different points of view to get a complete and accurate institutional picture. Presidents who encourage constituencies and institutional personnel to express their opinions are better prepared to face institutional challenges.

In contrast to a Rubik's Cube that matches colored sides, the Institutional Advancement Model for Presidential Leadership must be positioned to blend advancement components (public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, government relations, institutional personnel, and constituencies) and variables (budgets, individual and organizational needs, goals, objectives, staff skill levels, etc.) to meet the institutional mission. All of the components and variables are dependent upon one another to achieve the institutional mission. Adjustments must continually be made since no one component and variable position will be effective forever.

15. Presidential search committees should examine a candidate's current leadership and potential for leadership in institutional advancement.

Presidential leadership in institutional advancement is paramount in importance to all presidential duties since the president represents the entire college or university. Evaluation of the president by trustees and constituencies will be focused on the CEO's ability to cultivate human resources and financial assets to meet the institutional mission. A candidate's leadership ability in advancement will ultimately determine an institution's success.

Presidents hired today must be visible leaders who are institutional extroverts rather than academic introverts. Since the president will devote a major effort to developing and improving external and internal relations, candidates should have a strong sense of responsibility to the institution and various constituencies. Candidates who embody the recommendations previously made will successfully lead a college or university in all institutional areas.

Suggestions for Further Study

Based on this study, the following suggestions are made:

1. It is suggested that further studies of this type be conducted, including those that concentrate solely in one institutional advancement area and/or at one institution. Since presidents have very demanding schedules, researchers will enhance their studies by conducting interviews rather than solely relying on survey instruments.
2. It is suggested that further studies be conducted to determine the relationship between presidents and vice presidents for institutional advancement.
3. It is suggested that further studies be conducted in all areas of institutional advancement in order to better understand the complexities of the profession and to meet challenges of the future.

References

Abegg, M.G. (1988, March 14). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Beeman, A.L. (1977). Foreword. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. ix-x). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beering, S.C. (1988, March 16). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Bernstein, J.H. (1986). Higher education and the state: New linkages for economic development (Report No. ISBN-0-86510-053-5). Washington, DC: Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education.

Bok, D. (1982). Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brecher, B. (1984). The fund-raising triangle. Currents, 10 (1), 24-26.

Brewster, C.W. (1988, March 16). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Brubacher, J.S. & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition. New York: Harper & Row.

Buchanan, J.S. (1981). Selling the small college. In W.K. Willmer (Ed.), Advancing the small college (pp. 47-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ciervo, A.V. (1986). Emphasizing professionalism, performance, and productivity. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 119-137). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cheshire, R.D. (1980). Strategies for advancement. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 9-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clugston, R.W. (1981). Advancing through the looking glass: A servant leadership perspective for the small college. In W.K. Willmer (Ed.), *Advancing the small college* (pp. 5-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M.D., & March J.G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education. (1987). *1987 membership directory*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cyert, R.M. (1988, March 8). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Dabney, V. (1981). *Mr. Jefferson's university: A history*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Davidson, R.C. (1956). The growth of college public relations. *College Public Relations Quarterly*, *7*, 15-19.

Dodds, H.W., Robb, F.C., & Taylor, R.R. (1962). *The academic president--educator or caretaker*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Donald, M.N. (1960). Implications of nonresponse for the interpretation of mail questionnaire data. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *24* (1), 99-114.

Dunn, C. (1988, April 4). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Dunn, J.A., Jr. (Ed.). (1986). *Enhancing the management of fund raising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fazio, C.R. & Fazio, C.R. (1984). Memo to the chief executive. *Currents*, *10* (1), 10-12.

Fisher, J.L. (1980a). Editor's notes. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), *Presidential leadership in advancement activities* (pp. vii-ix). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fisher, J.L. (1985a). Keeping our place at the academic table. *Currents*, *11* (8), 11-14.

Fisher, J.L. (1984). *Power of the presidency*. New York: Macmillan.

Fisher, J.L. (1985b). Role of the public college or university president in fund raising. In M.J. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development (pp. 49-56). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Fisher, J.L. (1987, October 22). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Fisher, J.L. (1980b). The president and professionals: A vital partnership. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 83-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Forman, R.G. (1980). The potential in alumni stewardship. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 45-56). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fram, E.H. (1979). The marketing role of a college or university president. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Instructional Research, San Diego, CA.

Francis, N.C. (1980). Fund raising at a developing institution. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 65-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Francis, N.C. (1975). The president's management role in development. In The President's Role In Development (pp. 2-5). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Freelen, R.E. (1980). Tasks in government relations. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 73-82). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goldman, R. (1987). Take the initiative. Currents, 13 (2), 46-51.

Grenzebach, J. (1984). Tales out of school. Currents, 10 (1), 28-30.

Harral, S. (1942). Public relations for higher education. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1982). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hesburgh, T.M. (1979). The Hesburgh papers: Higher values in education. Kansas City, KS: Andrews and McMeel.

Hilton, J. (1985). Be yourself. Currents, 11 (6), 31-32.

Holderman, J.B. (1988, April 7). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Hullar, T.L. (1988, March 24). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Jacobson, H.K. (1986). Skills and criteria for managerial effectiveness. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 13-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, G.W. (1988, March 21). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Kennedy, R.L. (1986). Imperatives and strategies for effective government relations. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 495-527). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kinnison, W.A. (1977). The president as pr boss. Currents, 3, 3-6.

Knoerle, J. (1975). The president's leadership role in motivating trustees, volunteers, and donors. In The President's Role In Development (pp. 20-25). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Kohr, R.V. (1977). Capital campaigning. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp.236-264). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D.A. (1983). Problem management: Learning from experience. In Srivastava, S., and Associates (Eds.), The Executive Mind. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lachman, R. (1985). Public and private sector differences: CEO's perceptions of their role environments. Academy of Management Journal, 28 (3), 671-680.

Larson, L.L., Bussom, R.S., Vicars, W., & Jauch, L. (1986). Proactive versus reactive manager: Is the dichotomy realistic? Journal of Management Studies, 23 (4), 385-400.

Manning, T.E. (1980). Institutional planning for development. Bulletin on Public Relations and Development, pp. 1-4.

McDonagh, E.C. & Rosenblum, A.L. (1965). A comparison of mailed questionnaires and subsequent structured interviews. Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, (1), 131-136.

McLaughlin, F. (1984). The president's role in the capital campaign. Currents, 10 (1), 6-8.

Mooney, C. (1988). As state legislatures get ready to open 1988 sessions, higher education's lobbyists shift into high gear. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 34, (18), pp. A11, A14.

Morison, S.E. (1935). The founding of Harvard College. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Muller, S. (1986). The definition and philosophy of institutional advancement. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 1-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelson, J.B. (1986). Planning: Establishing program goals and strategies. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 44-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oregon State System of Higher Education. (1969). Toward improving the public affairs function. Portland, OR: Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Packard, R.D. (1988, March 30). Personal interview.

Panas, J. (1984). Mega gifts: Who gives them, who get them. Chicago: Pluribus Press.

Perkins, D.R. (1983). Marketing your own Iacocca. Currents, 9 (8), 22-24.

Persons, C.E. (1946). Public relations for colleges and universities: A manual of practical procedure. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pickett, W.L. (1984). What determines fund-raising effectiveness? Currents, 10 (8), 45-48.

President's Ideajournal. (1982). Strategic planning for effective institutional promotion (Research Rep. CC1/IP/V16/N4/782/C20). Hornell, NY: Author.

Quehl, G.H. (1987, November 30). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Quigg, H.G. (Ed.). (1986). The successful capital campaign: From planning to victory celebration. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Rabbino, I.L. (1980). The many roles in public relations. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 27-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Radock, M. (1977). Overview of executive management. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 441-447). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ransdell, G.A. (1986). Understanding professional roles and program mission. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of Institutional Advancement (2nd ed.). (pp.373-386). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Remington, R.D. (1988, March 22). Telephone interview. Flagstaff, AZ: Cline Library, Northern Arizona University.

Richards, M.D., & Sherratt, G.R. (1981). Institutional advancement strategies in hard times (Contract No. 400-77-73). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Riechley, R.A. (1977). Alumni programs. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 304-315). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ritter, B. (1984). A pair of aces. Currents, 10 (1), 20-22.

Rosenberg, J.M. (1983). Dictionary of business and management (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ross, H.L. (1963). The inaccessible respondent: A note on privacy in city and country. Public Opinion Quarterly, 27 (2), 269-275.

Rowland, A.W. (1977). Perspectives on institutional advancement. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 552-538). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rowland, A.W. (1986). Preface. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of Institutional Advancement (2nd ed.). (p. xiii). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1956). Mark Hopkins and the log: Williams College, 1836-1872. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Rydell, E.E. (1977). External relations. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 47-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shaw, K.A. (1980). The president and the publics. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 19-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shaw, W.B. (1930). The alumni. In R.A. Kent (Ed.), Higher Education in America (pp. 652-689). Boston: Ginn and Company.

Shaw, W.B. (Ed.). (1942). The University of Michigan: An enyclopedic survey (Vol. 1). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Shea, J.M. (1986). Organizational issues in designing advancement programs. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 31-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, G.T. (1986). The chief executive and advancement. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (2nd ed.). (pp. 697-705). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Staff. (1980). How managers spend their time. Management Review, 69 (8), 36.

Steeh, C.G. (1981). Trends in nonresponse rates, 1952-1979. Public Opinion Quarterly, 45 (1), 40-49.

Stover, W.S. (1930). Alumni stimulation by the american college president. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sweet, D.E. (1980). Minding our own "business." In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), Presidential leadership in advancement activities (pp. 37-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tilden, S.W. (1980). Working with the media: Basic school pr guide. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

Topor, R.S. (1986). *Institutional image: How to define, improve, market it*. Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Vickrey, J.F., Jr. (1977). Principles for effective government relations. In A.W. Rowland (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 349-361). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whittier, H.S., Jr. (1980). Presidential commitment to educational fund raising. In J.L. Fisher (Ed.), *Presidential leadership in advancement activities* (pp. 57-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wieck, K. (1983). Managerial thought in the context of action. In Srivastava, S., and Associates (Eds.), *The Executive Mind*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williamson, M.L. (1987, November). An inside look at presidential time use. *Presentation at the Fourth Annual Creative Management in Higher Education Conference*. New Orleans, LA.

Willmer, W.K. (1981). The institutional advancement process at the small college. In W.K. Willmer (Ed.), *Advancing the small college* (pp. 69-90). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Worthy, F.S. (1988). How CEOs manage their time. *Fortune*, *117* (2), 88-97.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, *55* (3), 67-78.

APPENDIX A

Date

Dear President:

You have been selected to participate in a national study on the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement (public relations, fund raising, alumni relations, and government relations). As a 13-year veteran of university relations, I am soliciting your cooperation in this project.

I have discussed the study with Terrel H. Bell, former U.S. Secretary of the Department of Education and now a professor of Educational Administration at the University of Utah; Gary H. Quehl, president of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE); and James L. Fisher, president emeritus of CASE. Each of these prominent leaders agree the president's role in institutional advancement is one of the imperatives for higher education.

In order to accurately obtain a president's perspective on institutional advancement, I am requesting that you personally complete the enclosed confidential questionnaire. A sampling of presidents will be interviewed by telephone as to their insight in institutional advancement and possible inclusion in a book. If you are willing to be interviewed or would like a copy of the survey results, please indicate your desires at the conclusion of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your consideration in this important study.

Sincerely,

John Michael Slinker
Researcher
Division of Research Services

PRESIDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE
The Role of the College or University
President in Institutional Advancement

1. **What importance do you place on the role of the president in the programs listed below for your institution to be successful with constituencies? Circle one response for each item.**

		High	Moderate	Low
A.	Public Relations.......	A	A	A
B.	Fund Raising...........	B	B	B
C.	Alumni Relations.......	C	C	C
D.	Government Relations...	D	D	D
E.	Overall Institutional Advancement Program....	E	E	E

2. **What do you believe is the basic function of the president in institutional advancement?** (Please print)

____
____
____
____

Why? ____________________________________
____
____

3. **What do you consider the most outstanding feature of your college's or university's institutional advancement program?** (Please print)

____
____
____

Why? ____________________________________
____
____

4. **To what degree are the goals and objectives for the areas listed below based on the institutional mission and clearly defined? Circle one response for each item.**

		High	Moderate	Low
A.	Public Relations.......	A	A	A
B.	Fund Raising...........	B	B	B
C.	Alumni Relations.......	C	C	C
D.	Government Relations...	D	D	D
E.	Overall Institutional Advancement Program....	E	E	E

5. How frequently do you complete the items below with your institutional advancement staff? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:
1. Weekly 2. Monthly 3. Twice a year
4. Annually 5. Every two or more years 6. Never

A. ___ Establish long-range goals & objectives.
B. ___ Review long-range goals & objectives.
C. ___ Establish short-range goals & objectives.
D. ___ Review short-range goals & objectives.
E. ___ Track advancement progress.
F. ___ Involve other offices in advancement.
G. ___ Establish budgets to coordinate with plans.
H. ___ Conduct research relating to constituencies.
I. ___ Communicate plans to faculty and staff.
J. ___ Services offered to faculty and staff.
K. ___ Faculty & staff encouraged to participate in advancement activities.

6. Select what you consider your institution's two strongest and two weakest programs.

	Strongest Programs (Circle 2)	**Weakest Programs (Circle 2)**
A. Overall Institutional Advancement Program............	A	A
B. Public Relations..................	B	B
C. Fund Raising......................	C	C
D. Alumni Relations..................	D	D
E. Government Relations..............	E	E
F. Other (specify)____________________	F	F

7. How do you value the following characteristics in your professional staff? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:
1. Very Important 2. Somewhat Important
3. Not Important 4. Negative

A. ___ Initiative.
B. ___ Creativity.
C. ___ Professional competence.
D. ___ Aggressiveness.
E. ___ Interpersonal skills.
F. ___ Influence with those in power.
G. ___ Cooperation.
H. ___ Support from faculty.
I. ___ Competitiveness.
J. ___ Tact.
K. ___ Effectiveness in dealing with constituencies.
L. ___ Personal ambition.
M. ___ Salesmanship.
N. ___ Frankness in dealing with others.
O. ___ Responsibility.
P. ___ Other (specify) ______________________________

8. How often do you rely on the following sources to find out what goes on in institutional advancement areas. Use one the following numbers for your corresponding answers:
1. Frequently 2. Occasionally 3. Seldom or Never

A. ___ Meetings.
B. ___ Personal conversations with advancement staff.
C. ___ Memoranda.
D. ___ Formal reports.
E. ___ Through faculty and staff.
F. ___ Other (specify) ______________________________

9. What degree of success do you expect in each of the following institutional advancement areas? Circle one response for each item.

	High Success	Moderate Success	Little or No Success
A. Public Relations......	A	A	A
B. Fund Raising..........	B	B	B
C. Alumni Relations......	C	C	C
D. Government Relations..	D	D	D
E. Overall Institutional Advancement Program...	E	E	E

10. How willing are you to become personally involved in the fund raising activities listed below? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:
1. Very Willing 2. Somewhat Willing
3. Hesitant 4. Unwilling

Accept responsibility to call on and close prospects contributing:

A. ___ Under $5,000.
B. ___ $5,000-10,000.
C. ___ $10,000-15,000.
D. ___ $15,000-20,000.
E. ___ $20,000-30,000.
F. ___ More than $30,000.
G. ___ Other (specify) ________________
H. ___ Designate prospects for the development office staff to call on.
I. ___ Assist with cultivation and solicit support from foundations and corporations.
J. ___ Host high-level luncheon or dinner meetings for prospective donors.
K. ___ Host luncheon or dinner meetings for persons contributing more than $10,000.

11. How willing are you to meet directly with the government relations individuals listed below? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:

1. Very Willing 2. Somewhat Willing
3. Hesitant 4. Unwilling

A. ___ The governor.
B. ___ Other executive branch members.
C. ___ State legislators.
D. ___ Congressional representatives.
E. ___ Educational lobbyists.

12. How willing are you to become personally involved in the alumni relations activities listed below? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:

1. Very Willing 2. Somewhat Willing
3. Hesitant 4. Unwilling

A. ___ Attend each alumni board meeting and stay the entire time.
B. ___ Make an appearance at each alumni board meeting and make a brief presentation.
C. ___ Attend selected alumni board meetings and stay the entire time.
D. ___ Make an appearance at selected alumni board meetings and make a brief presentation.
E. ___ Attend all alumni events.
F. ___ Attend the majority of alumni events.
G. ___ Attend important alumni events.
H. ___ Write appeals letters for various alumni support.
I. ___ Write a column for the alumni publication.

13. How willing are you to become personally involved in the public relations activities listed below? Use one of the following numbers for your corresponding answers:

1. Very Willing 2. Somewhat Willing
3. Hesitant 4. Unwilling

A. ___ Be the featured speaker at various events.
B. ___ Meet with news media about non-controversial issues.
C. ___ Meet with news media about controversial issues.
D. ___ Speak to community groups.
E. ___ Meet with individuals from the community.
F. ___ Speak to faculty groups.
G. ___ Meet with individual faculty members.
H. ___ Speak to staff groups.
I. ___ Meet with individual staff members.
J. ___ Speak to student groups.
K. ___ Meet with individual students.
L. ___ Speak to parent groups.
M. ___ Meet with individual parents.

14. How do you rate your involvement in the programs listed below? Circle one response for each item.

		High	Moderate	Low
A.	Public Relations.......	A	A	A
B.	Fund Raising...........	B	B	B
C.	Alumni Relations.......	C	C	C
D.	Government Relations...	D	D	D
E.	Overall Institutional Advancement Program....	E	E	E

15. How much involvement do you desire in the programs listed below? Circle one response for each item.

		High	Moderate	Low
A.	Public Relations.......	A	A	A
B.	Fund Raising...........	B	B	B
C.	Alumni Relations.......	C	C	C
D.	Government Relations...	D	D	D
E.	Overall Institutional Advancement Program....	E	E	E

16. What year did you assume this presidency? ______

17. Previous job title and institution? ____________________

____

18. Indicate below the areas of institutional advancement in which you have had professional experience and/or training.

____ Public Relations   ____ Fund Raising

____ Alumni Relations   ____ Government Relations

19. A sampling of presidents will be interviewed as to their insight in institutional advancement and possible inclusion in a book. Would you be willing to schedule a telephone interview? ___ Yes ___ No

20. Check here ___ for a copy of the study results.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. Return the questionnaire to the address below using the enclosed envelope.

John Michael Slinker, Division of Research Services,
Center for Excellence in Education, NAU Box 5774,
Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011.
Phone: 602: 523-7131

APPENDIX B

Date

Dear Public Relations Director:

Your president and institution have been selected to participate in a national study on the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement. As a 13-year colleague in university relations, I am soliciting your cooperation in this project.

I have discussed the study with Terrel H. Bell, former U.S. Secretary of the Department of Education and now a professor of Educational Administration at the University of Utah; Gary H. Quehl, president of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE); and James L. Fisher, president emeritus of CASE. Each of these prominent leaders agree that there is a need for the study and believe the president's role in institutional advancement is one of the imperatives for higher education.

The two-part study requires you to complete the enclosed confidential background questionnaire. Your president will complete an empirical questionnaire and selected presidents will be interviewed via telephone. Please encourage your president to indicate a willingness to participate in the interview portion of the study.

In addition, feel free to contribute your own written comments on the role of the president in institutional advancement. Such documentation will be valuable and enhance contributions for a book I intend to publish. Thank you for your consideration in this important study.

Sincerely,

John Michael Slinker, Researcher
Division of Research Services

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE
The Role of the College or University
President in Institutional Advancement

(Please print or type)

Institution: ______________________________
___ Public ___ Independent Private ___ Private Religious
Total Enrollment: __________
President: ______________________________
Office Phone (Area Code): ____________________
Assistant to the President: ____________________
Office Phone (Area Code): ____________________

1. **Indicate the total annual 1987-88 budget (salaries, operating, equipment, travel, professional services/ consultants, etc.) for the areas listed below.**

   Total College or University Budget $____________
   Public Relations/Communications $__________
   Fund Raising/Development $____________
   Alumni Relations (excluding periodical) $__________
   Alumni Periodical $____________
   How many individuals are on your alumni periodical mailing list? _____
   How many times a year is the periodical mailed? ____
   Government Relations $__________
   Other Institutional Advancement Areas (specify) $_____
   ____

2. **Indicate below the amount of funds raised in 1986-87.**

   Annual Fund $__________
   Capital Campaign $________
   Foundation Grants $________
   Individual Colleges and Schools $__________
   Planned Giving $__________
   Alumni Giving $__________
   Other (specify) $______________________________
   Other (specify) $______________________________

3. **Indicate the number of staff in the areas listed below.**

	Professional	**Support/Clerical**
Public Relations/ Communications.........	_____	_____
Fund Raising/Development..	_____	_____
Alumni Relations..........	_____	_____
Government Relations......	_____	_____

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. This confidential questionnaire should be returned to the address below using the enclosed envelope.

John Michael Slinker, Division of Research Services, Center for Excellence in Education, NAU Box 5774, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona 86011. Phone: 602: 523-7131

APPENDIX C

JUDGEMENT/STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE BY CATEGORY WITH LOCATION AND ENROLLMENT
N=46

Judgement sample institutions are in bold face.

Public (N=22)

Ohio State University (Columbus) 53,199
Arizona State University (Tempe) 40,556
Purdue University (West Lafayette, IN) 31,987
University of Maryland College Park, 38058
Indiana University (Bloomington) 30,579
University of Iowa (Iowa City) 29,651
Pennsylvania State University (University Park) 34,932
San Diego State University (CA) 34,314
Rutgers, The State University (New Brunswick, NJ) 33,524
The University of Washington (Seattle) 34,086
University of South Carolina-Columbia 20,777
University of California-Davis 19,835
Wichita State University (KS) 16,902
George Mason University (Fairfax, VA) 17,094
Radford University (Virginia) 7,000
California State University-Dominquez Hills (Carson) 7,651
Kennesaw College (Marietta, GA) 6,866
Northeast Missouri State University (Kirksville) 6,515
Winthrop College (Rock Hill, SC) 4,934
Bemidji State University (MN) 4,262
Western Oregon State College (Monmouth) 3,032
Fort Lewis College (Durango, CO) 3,697

Private Independent (N=16)

Boston University (MA) 27,181
University of Southern California (Los Angeles) 26,936
University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia) 17,485
George Washington University (Washington, D.C.) 19,322
University of Miami (FL) 13,700
Washington University-St. Louis (MO) 10,581
Brown University (Providence, RI) 6,873
Carnegie-Mellon University (Pittsburgh, PA) 6,554
Iona College (New Rochelle, NY) 6,019
University of Hartford (CT) 7,611
Marist College (Poughkeepsie, NY) 4,471
Bradley University (Peoria, IL) 4,719
Polytechnic University (Brooklyn, NY) 3,241
University of Redlands (CA) 2,643
Knox College (Galesburg, IL) 929
Ripon College (WI) 860

Private Religious (N=8)

Brigham Young University (Provo, UT) 26,894
Baylor University (Waco, TX) 11,481
Duke University (Durham, NC) 9,781
Southern Methodist University (Dallas, TX) 9,048
Hobart and William Smith Colleges (Geneva, NY) 1,850
Mount Vernon Nazarene College (OH) 1,056
Clarke College (Dubuque, IA) 857
Columbia Union College (Takoma Park, MD) 927

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

NAME OF AUTHOR: John Michael Slinker

PLACE OF BIRTH: Lafayette, Indiana

DATE OF BIRTH: January 8, 1952

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED:

Northern Arizona University, Ed.D., 1988
Eastern New Mexico University, B.S., 1974; M.A., 1979

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS HELD:

Director of University News and Publications, Northern Arizona University, 1982-1986
News Services Director/Sports Information Director, Eastern New Mexico University, 1974-1982

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)
Professional Photographers of America
National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) Sports Information Directors
College Sports Information Directors of America (COSIDA)
New Mexico Press Association
New Mexico Broadcasters Association
New Mexico Sports Writers and Sportscasters Association

PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS:

Bronze Medal, Photocommunications via Print, CASE National Competition, 1985
National Award of Excellence for Outstanding Achievement in Design, Layout, and Production, Consolidated Papers, 1985
First Place, Outstanding Photographic Cover, University Network Publishing, National Alumni Magazine Competition, 1984
Second Place, Most Improved Publication, University Network Publishing, National Alumni Magazine Competition, 1984
Outstanding Professional Employee, Eastern New Mexico University, 1979

Best Cover, COSIDA, Women's Basketball Brochure, 1982
Special Appreciation Award for Outstanding Service to the Eastern Sun-Press, The Associated Students of Eastern New Mexico University, 1982
Award of Excellence for Internal Relations Program, CASE Southwest District, 1982
Achievement Award for Internal Relations Program "Achievement Recognition Program," CASE Southwest District, 1981
Second Place, COSIDA, Golf Brochure, 1980
Third Place, COSIDA, Volleyball Brochure, 1980
Photographic Exhibit, Golden Library, Eastern New Mexico University, 1979
Seventh Place, NAIA, Football Brochure, 1979
Award of Merit, "Sessions of Expressions" photographic essay, CASE Southwest District, 1978
Eighth Place, NAIA, Track and Field Brochure, 1978
Feature Photographs, Jack Williamson Story, New Mexico Magazine, 1977
Third Place, COSIDA, Cross Country Brochure, 1975
Honorable Mention, COSIDA, Football Brochure, 1975
Eighth Place, NAIA, Football Brochure, 1975
Tenth Place, NAIA, Football Brochure, 1974

OTHER HONORS AND AWARDS:

Outstanding Young Man of America, 1982, 1980, 1977
Wrote Film Script, "New Mexico, The Enchanted Land," for the State of New Mexico, 1982
Alumni of the Year, Eta Sigma Chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity, 1982, 1979, 1976